Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 9807 Cudell Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-18 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 57. ST. LOUIS, MO. MARCH 1929.

THE MINISTRY AND ORDINATION

By Professor J. O. Evjen, Ph.D., Th.D.

I. The Ministry

The major part of this study should deal with the problem of Ordination to the Ministry. Since, however, there are few terms in theology so open to misunderstanding, and so persistently misunderstood in many circles, as "ministry," a comparatively full discussion of this term is necessary in order to get a proper evaluation of ordination. Many a pious mother, yes pious minister, too, has attempted to repeat the act of Hannah, the mother of Samuel, who promised to give her son "unto Jehovah all the days of his life," "that he may appear before Jehovah, and there abide forever." The result of Hannah's promise was that Samuel "did minister unto Jehovah before Eli the priest."

The age of the Levitical Priesthood has passed. But not the age of Levitical thinking. It controls the Catholic Church, and obtains with many Protestants, for example the High Church Anglicans and the Neo-Lutherans, but also with other Protestants who are more difficult to rubricate, but who, in their admiration for sacerdotal-like performances of a minister, would endorse the sentiment of a lady, that once exclaimed, upon hearing a minister preach: "How blessed it is to hear the Word of God from *consecrated* lips!"

The sentiment behind such an expression may assume the wish and deed of a Hannah: that a member in the family enter the public ministry, because it is the highest of all callings. The result may be that this member, more or less against his will, studies

for, and enters upon, the ministry, in order to comply with the wishes of relations, though another calling might have been far more acceptable, suitable, and useful. Due to this Levitical leaven, the spirit of the New Covenant, with its emphasis on the universal priesthood of believers and the sanctity of all noble vocations, one being as sacred as the other, has been circumscribed in its operations. The scriptural teaching, that the highest calling in life is to be a Christian, has been obscured by the belief that the highest calling is to be a minister, a clergyman. Greatly as we cherish this vocation and love to prepare men for it, we have no right to elevate it above what Scripture teaches concerning it.

What, then, is the Ministry? What is Ordination: does it elevate a man above his fellowmen, religiously, dogmatically? In replying to these questions, we shall, after a preliminary statement about ordination, make the discussion of the Ministry the first part of our study. The second part will be given to the treatment of Ordination. Both parts, naturally, will have to deal with the Church proper, or the congregation of all believers; and the "Church," in its derived meaning, which elects and ordains men for the public office of the ministry. Special attention will be given to the teachings of the first century, of the Reformation, and of the last decades: the aim being to set forth the evangelical, Protestant view of the Ministry, and of Ordination as the formal ratification of it. In our investigation, we draw much on German and Scandinavian scholarship as the most reliable testimony to the teaching of Lutheranism; and, much on American-Reformed opinion and practice, as a happy gratitude-deserving contribution to church history; though England, Switzerland, France are not neglected and due respect is paid to Western and Eastern Catholicism wherever it may serve to set in relief the grand Protestant doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, of the sanctity of every noble calling, of religious equality and liberty, in the trust with which we trust God and He trusts us.

Ordination, in the evangelical meaning, is a public act authorizing a person as a Christian minister, a member of the order (I use this word advisedly, in the evangelical sense. It may also be translated estate, class) administering the clerical office as a mandatary of the Church visible. As an act of publicity, it approves or ratifies a call to the ministry. [1]

In the Roman Catholic church, ordination is an involved act, elevating a man from the laity to the priesthood, which this Church considers as a sacramental order of privileged fellowship with God,

[1] Richard Rothe has well said: "Ordinare" in Latin never means to ordain a priest, but to induct one into office.

more intimate with him, and more sacred, than that which an unordained Christian is able to attain. It makes the ordained person a mediator between God and man: priest. The Catholic Church is the priesthood, the laity is only an appendix. No one can be saved outside the Roman Catholic Church; that is, without the mediation of this priesthood. The naive Catholic believes that the benediction received from newly ordained priest is surcharged with a celestial electricity. One ought, as the popular saying has it, ride a horse to death, in order to get the first blessing of a priest just ordained. Coming home immediately after the consecration, such a priest is received as a superterrestrial being. It may not be with just the identical reverence with which a savage worships the sun, or the superstitious Lycaonians prepared to sacrifice to Barnabas, their alias for handsome Jupiter, and Paul their alias for Mercurius, the divinity of eloquence. But the affinity is unmistakable.

Contrary to the Catholic conception of church and its attendant priesthood, is the genuine evangelical view, which with Luther, defines the church as the congregation of all believers scattered all over the world, the priesthood of believers having equal religious rights (not necessarily juridic) and duties, and exercising them according to ability and opportunity. This universal church, naturally includes both Protestant and Catholic, if they are sincere believers; and excludes both, if they are not, no matter what their relation to the "visible" or institutional church may be. In this Church a priest, clergyman, minister—be he a pope, a bishop, or a village parson—can be for his fellowman religiously nothing more, as Karl Heim says, than "a brotherly counsellor and fatherly interceding friend." [2]

Ordination in the Eastern Church holds a midway position between that of the Evangelical and that of Roman Catholic Church. It does not impress upon the priest, as it is thought to do in the Roman Catholic Church, a "character indelebilis," and does not establish the same cleavage between layman and priest. The priest in the Eastern Church ceases to be a religiously important personage when he leaves the altar or temple, being then like one of the common people. The lower clergy in this Church may carry on an occupation. They are hierurgs rather than hierarchs, and may not exercise lordship over the people. Even the bishop in this church is far less hierarchic than the bishop in the Roman denomination.

---

[2] Karl Heim, Das Wesen des evangelischen Christentums, 1926, p. 94.

The Anglican View

But even in the Protestant, or Evangelical Church, there are different conceptions of ordination. Whether it cares to be called Protestant or not, the Anglican Church leans, on the question of ordination, on Rome, not very many of her clergy being of the mind of Dean Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, who in *Christian Institutions* (1881, p. 213 seq.) wrote: "In the first beginning of Christianity there was no such institution as the clergy, and it is conceivable that there may be a time when they shall cease to be. But though the office of the Christian ministry was not one of the original and essential elements of the Christian religion, yet it grew naturally out of the want which was created."

The New Lutheran View

The Neo-Lutherans hold opinions hard by those of the High Anglicans. Professor Alois Knöpfler, Catholic church historian, says: "They wish to confess Luther's justification by faith, the sola fides, but not the invisibility of the Church and the universal priesthood. They declare that the office of the ministry is juris divini and hold quite Romanizing views concerning sacrifice, ordination and the sacraments, wherefore they have been decried by their opponents as German Puseyites. Among the representatives of this tendency are: Vilmar . . . , Thomasius . . . , Hofman . . . , Keil . . . , Delitzsch . . . , Stahl . . . , Kahnis . . . , Luthardt."

This characterization, not without Roman sympathy, is correct. In the main, it is repeated by another Catholic church historian, Prof. J. Marx, who explains that the Neo-Lutherans regard the ordination of ministers as instituted by Christ; they desire to make the Lord's Supper, and not the sermon, the central thing in worship, more according to Catholic usage; and they favor the introduction of the Confessional.

This description of Neo-Lutheranism agrees with the one given by Dr. P. Madsen, Bishop in the Church of Denmark (Lutheran) and, before this, professor of dogmatics in the University of Copenhagen. This able scholar in his *Den kristelige Troslaere,* perhaps the most readable work on Dogmatics published within the last two generations in the Lutheran Church, says: "Within the Lutheran denomination the so-called Neo-Lutherans (Löhe, Kliefoth, Stahl, Vilmar) have, in principle, forsaken the Lutheran point of view and adopted a Romanizing view of the church as an institution of grace, differing from the congregation as the communion of believers." [3] Again: "Related to the Catholic conception of or-

[3] P. Madsen, Den kristelige Troslaere, Ed. by L. Bergman, Copenhagen, 1912, 687. The footnote adds the names of A. F. C. Vilmar, A. Münchmeyer, and F. Delitzsch.

dination is that of the Neo-Lutherans, according to whom the office of the ministry, as over against the universal priesthood of believers, is something quite different from the latter; namely, a special estate, instituted by the Lord." [4]

Neo-Lutheranism in America

Neo-Lutheranism is a strong tendency in America. This is partly due to Wilhelm Löhe who exerted much influence on a body like the Iowa Synod; to Kliefoth who, not to mention others, influenced the former General Council, of which the Swedish Augustana Synod was a part—it, again, being additionally influenced by the Neo-Lutheran group in Sweden.

The Norwegian Lutherans in the West were, for the most part, either Neo-Lutheran or inclined to the viewpoint of the Missourian school. The former group was trained for decades in the high church text book on Dogmatics by Dr. Krogh-Tonning, of Norway, who, following the principles of his own teaching, finally, left the Lutheran Church and joined the Roman Catholic. In the latter, western, group the transition to Neo-Lutheranism appears in the comparison of statements made by Dr. Ulrik Vilhelm Koren, President of the Norwegian Synod (1894-1910), and by Prof. O. E. Brandt, vice-president of Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.—statements in regard to the ministry.

Dr. Koren, trained in the University of Christiania, controverting Professor Wenaas, president of Augsburg theological Seminary, who was influenced by Thomasius, wrote, in the seventies: "Prof. W. . . . can not be ignorant of what we have stressed very often that, when the fifth article in the Augsburg Confession binds the imparting of faith and therewith justification to the ministry of the word—the meaning of ministry of the Word is not the ecclesiastical office of the ministry or the ministers but only, in general, the ministration of the Word and the Sacraments, by whomsoever administered. Prof. W. . . . , as well as we, teach that the acts as a rule shall be performed by persons called thereunto; but this does not institute a sacrament of the office. [5]

Professor O. E. Brandt, of younger vintage, and trained in America, apparently departs from Koren's teaching, if he is quoted correctly, in *Lutheraneren,* March 18, 1925: "Christ has therefore established a spiritual priesthood, in which every Christian testifies about Christ's great love of the world. By the side of this

[4] Ibid. pp. 704 seq.
G. Rietschel adds Dieckhoff and Paul Haupt to the list. Haupt finds two offices directly instituted by God: that of the pastor and that of the bishop. He also regards the Episcopal polity as divinely instituted (Lehrbuch der Liturgik II, p. 414).

[5] V. Koren, Samlede Skrifter, 1912.

Christ has also *instituted certain servants of the Word,* whose whole time is dedicated to the ministry."

The Formula for the Government of the General Synod, 1888, reads (1) "Our Lord and Saviour himself instituted the *clerical office* in the New Testament Church, and made it of perpetual standing." (2) It regards the *Bible* as the *"juridical code"* of the church councils of individual churches. (3) It also makes Christ the "true and only head" of the external or visible Church. These three statements are pronouncedly Reformed and, at the same time, more in agreement with Catholic than Lutheran thinking, as will be evident from a later discussion. The first statement is due to misinterpreting of the Augsburg Confession, Article V. Representatives of Lutheranism having this misinterpretation of Article V, says Rietschel, "may claim Calvin for their support. He does not deduce the office of the ministry from the general priesthood of believers but establishes it on the immediate institution through Christ according to Eph. 4: 11." [6]

Missouri Lutherans

The "Missouri" Lutherans make the local congregation the dispenser of ministration, transferring the dispensation to the minister. If the local congregation here is considered as an organization of the secular order, there is no theoretical objection to this teaching. If the congregation is considered as divine, or the body of Christ, this teaching, because it treats the Bible as a legal codex for polity, has a little of the Romanizing leaven, savoring of the *jus divinum* idea. For, to use the words of R. Sohm: "The essence of Catholicism consists in this that it does not distinguish between the Church in its religious meaning (the Church of Christ) and the Church in its juridic meaning. . . . The Church of Christ is for it (Catholicism) a juridically constituted organization." [7]

The Congregational Aspect and the New Approach to Luther

Some of the same leaven is found in other Protestant bodies. The Baptists and Congregationalists claim that the local church, in contrast to a synod or other form of group church, is divine, or is the right form of the kingdom of God on earth. [8] The Presbyterians have argued for the divine right of a government by elders, the episcopals for the divine right of episcopal rule. Each

[6] G. Rietschel, Lehrbuch der Liturgik II, p. 412.

[7] R. Sohm, Wesen und Ursprung des Katholizismus.

[8] This view is held by the Lutheran Free Church. See my articles on this body in "Distinctive Doctrines . . . of the Evang. Luth. Church, 1914, p. 246 seq.; and on its leader, G. Sverdrup, in Herzog-Hauck, Realencyclopädie für Prot. Theologie und Kirche, XXIV, 537-555.

of these denominations has taught that Scripture prescribes an infallible form of government for the church. They thus give to the Bible a statutory significance and do not regard it, so far as polity is concerned, as a record of examples or suggestions of limited applicability, capable of extended modifications, even nullification without harm. Luther, arguing on the assumption that there were deacons in the congregations of the apostolic age, stated that they might have been quite necessary in those days, when there was no Christian government dispensing poor relief, but they were not necessary at all times. Calvin indeed argued for the divine right institution of four church offices: of the minister, of the teacher, of the elder, and of the deacon. But there are many of his followers in our day who, having abandoned his argument for a polity by divine right, properly, and in the spirit of Luther, regard their particular church government merely as one of expediency—and not of divine right. One of the foremost Dutch theologians of today, Slotemaker de Bruine, while thinking that these four offices are very expedient, sets aside Calvin's claim that they are divinely instituted. For him, also another order would conceivably work well. He thinks, however, that Calvin's four offices are more efficient than the one office of traditional Lutheranism. "What Calvin wrought was better than what he thought."

While a great many of the "Reformed" grant this, it is more difficult for them to accept Luther's idea of the invisible church against the visible-invisible church of Calvin, who regarded the visible Church organization as the indispensable scabbard for the sword, the spiritual Church, and who believed that non-membership in the visible church organization was tantamount to slighting the Church of Christ. The conception of what constitutes the Church, strictly speaking, determines the evaluation of church edifices. Consistency of thinking demands this. But many, happily, think inconsistently and arrive at liberal "conclusions," even when the premises are illiberal. Luther's conception of church was evangelical; his conception of the "office" or "offices" was equally evangelical, though this happy sequence may have been due to his spiritual structure rather than his logic. We may, therefore, waive, for the present, the discussion of Church and confine ourselves to certain views about the ministry as set forth in creedal statements.

Augsburg Confession, Article V

The older Reformed school, together with its present adherents, really hold that the incumbents of these four offices sponsored by Calvin are not laymen, but of a clerical rank. According to Luther, they are all, like all other Christians, laymen. John Kunze, Neo-Lutheran, dissents from the Lutheran as well as the old Re-

formed idea, by maintaining that these offices save that of the ministry discharge a "secular work." The office of the minister alone is divine; but the ecclesiastical offices recently introduced in the Lutheran Church as auxiliaries of the ministerial office are de jure humano. Thus far Kunze. [9]

The conception of *ordination* will depend on the views concerning the ministry. Does the Christian minister, as distinct from the "laity," hold his office by divine or human right?

The Neo-Lutherans answer: By divine right. They base their creedal claim for this answer by referring to Article V. of the Augsburg Confession,

"That we may obtain this faith, the ministry of teaching the gospel, and administering the sacraments, was instituted. For by the word and sacraments, as by instruments, the Holy Spirit is given, Who works faith, where and when it pleases God, in those that hear the gospel; to wit, that God not for the sake of our merits, but for Christ's sake, justifies those who believe that they for Christ's sake are received into favor."

The Latin heading of this article is "De ministerio ecclesiastico." English translations are "Of the ministry of the church," "Of the ministerial office," etc. Since the headings are of a later date, a more appropriate superscription would be, as Kolde suggests: "De Verbo", "Concerning the Word"; or "Concerning the means of grace." Kolde quotes a statement from Feuerlin, 1742, that this article treats the origin and Causes of justifying faith and thus is in close relationship with the preceding article "On Justification." [10]

Now, Article V does not discuss the necessity of the office of the public ministry, but the necessity of the word and sacraments as means of grace.

The Word must be proclaimed, the sacraments (the "visible" Word parallel to the "audible" Word) must be administered, so that man can attain faith, independent as to whether the proclamation or administration takes place through a "minister" or a layman, man or woman. A father, a mother are for their children, and sincere Sunday school teachers are for their pupils as much *ministri verbi divini,* as a pastor is a *minister verbi divini* for his congregation. A layman speaking the Word of God to his comrade is *religiously* a servant of the Word, as much as the ordained preacher. The fact that this interpretation refers to *ministrations,* and not to *ministers,* is confirmed by the reply to The Augsburg

---

[9] Kunze, Symbolik, 1922, p. 192 seq.

[10] Kolde, Die Augsburgische Konfession, 1911, p. 35. G. Rietschel, Lehrbuch der Liturgik II, p. 412 agrees with Kolde.

Confession made at the Diet of Worms by the Catholics in *Confutatio pontifica:* "In articulo quinto, quod spiritus s. per verba et sacramenta detur, tanquam per instrumenta, comprobatur." It is, secondly, confirmed by the Schwabach Articles VII and VIII, stating, that, in order to get faith, God has instituted the "office of preaching or oral word, namely the gospel;" and "beside this oral word, God has also instituted external tokens, namely baptism and the Lord's Supper," (Kolde 127). It is, thirdly, established by the Marburg Articles VI and VIII. In Melanchthon's Loci (1543), *vox evangelii* and *ministerium evangelii* are identical. *Ministerium* is defined as the voice of the gospel, *heard, read, pondered.* These confirmations can be augmented by a great many statements of Luther, which are numerous and weighty enough to constitute a special article. Enough, then, for the present about Article V, discussing a *religious* necessity.

Augsburg Confession, Article XIV

Article XIV reads: Concerning the church order they teach that no one should teach publicly in the church or administer the sacraments unless he be regularly called (nisi rite vocatus).

This article was written to contradict the false accusation of Eck that the Evangelicals were as spiritually anarchistic in regard to ecclesiastical sanctions as were the enthusiasts, who, heedless of the existing beneficial order, would force their extreme ideas upon church gatherings, by violently changing or setting aside such ceremonies as they rightly or wrongly disapproved of; by mounting the pulpits, no matter what their intellectual qualifications were; by sometimes demolishing church furniture. These enthusiasts spiritualized the universal priesthood to such an extent that they made the spiritual equality before God tantamount to absolute equality in all human affairs, disregarding civic as well as canonic law, even in cases where the latter was commendable as a matter of good order. They set aside historic order, and insisted that the unschooled Christian was just as well qualified to preach publicly as the trained clergyman. They even wanted to oust learned clerics as inferior to the unlearned. When the Catholic church often insisted that a law, custom, or regulation *must* be observed on penalty of the loss of salvation, the enthusiasts would insist that it *must not* be observed on the same penalty. When the Catholic said, this *must be* so, the enthusiasts said this *must not be* so.

The followers of Luther said, It *may* be so. Hence the use of *"debeat"* in this article. The article recognized the value of the customary public ministry, usually the one-man ministry. This ministry was not regarded by the followers of Luther as an institution ordered by Scripture anymore than Sunday was regarded

as prescribed by Scripture. Luther had church gatherings on Sunday; not because Scripture dictated it, or because the church had commanded it, but because Sunday was the usual day for worship. He regarded any other day of the week as equally sacred. In fact the whole year was sacred Sunday or secular weekday for him, who saw *Gottesdienst* in the meanest manual labor, if the laborer's heart was right with God. But he made no change; for the order in vogue served well, perhaps better than any attempted change. Thus he recognized the value of the ministry which article XVI refers to, a ministry of *human order,* but too valuable to be disrupted by enthusiastic iconoclastic practices. Luther was equally far removed from the idea that only an ordained man can function in a pulpit and at an altar, as that a layman would desecrate them. Here was no question as to whether the leader of the church had one (order) or many consecrations (ordines) or none at all: or as to whether he was a "laic" or a "cleric." The question was what arrangement, indirectly, is most helpful for promoting the gospel: either an arrangement which permits any irresponsible person to inflict his presence and ideas on a public gathering, or one that protects the congregation from such persons, and duly calls (here: rite vocatus) for it such persons as can edify it by the gospel. The Catholic bishops were the authorities to appoint such ministers, but they did this unsatisfactorily. Some authority —what authority is not specified—should exercise the responsibility for the public. It might be a city council, for all that.

Rudolf Sohm has given classic expression to the idea underlying Article XV:

Religiously not only the "How" of the legal ordering of the office of preaching and the congregation, but also the "That," the *existence* of the public office of preaching in the legally constituted congregation is *indifferent* (For, the "true Church exists also without the body," as Luther says) . . ." Article XIV, as do XV and XVI are concerned about the order of the visible *Christenheit;* therefore with an order which indeed has religious motivation, but no religious content. Consequently this order expresses no *spiritually* effective, and therefore no necessary "divine law." [11]

[11] Sohm Kirchenrecht II, 1923, p. 141. Cfr. Buchwald-Kawerau. . . Luthers Werke, Berlin, 1905, on Vom Papstthum zu Rom I, 109 seq. The founder of "*Konfessionskunde*" Professor N. N. Clausen, of the University of Copenhagen, emphasizes the fact that Article XIV does not say with the Catholic Church, that no one can (*nemo potest*) administer the sacraments, but that "*nemo debeat.*" "The sacrament possesses validity and strength in and of itself. It does not acquire this from the (visible) church or from a special ecclesiastical character possessed by the servant of the Church. The administration of the sacraments and the word cannot here be conceived of as being bound to any ministerial *ordination.* Clausen quotes Luther, who, in advo-

The Latin text presents Article XIV under the heading (added later) "De ordine ecclesiastico"; the German, under "Vom Kirchenregiment." An older English translation of Chr. H. Schott, at one time pastor in Leipzig, offers the heading "Of Church Orders." [12] Another translation into English [13] has "of the ecclesiastical office." Oscar Bensow's Swedish text [14] has "of the ecclesiastical estate" Professor Clausen suggests *"politia ecclesiastica,"* as the most fitting superscription, a suggestion from the Apology of Melanchthon. The Lutheran High Church tendency regards Article XIV as a phase of Article V and prefers the title "The Ecclesiastical Order" to the German "Kirchenregiment," claiming that it considers not the external government, but the work of the shepherd—contrary to Sohm, who says it pertains to the "sichtbare weltliche Christenheit"; that is it has nothing directly to do with the "geistliche Christenheit." Sohm has spoken the liberating word and shed light where much confusion has reigned in regard to the interpretation.

In order to get a full reaction of a leading modern scholar on the bearing that Augsburg Confession Article V and especially article XIV have on the ministry, let us refer to E. Chr. Achelis, who says that article V "does not refer to the necessity of the office of the ministry, but to the necessity of the Word and the Sacraments . . . For a clear knowledge of the doctrine of the Confession must be observed. First, throughout, the special *ordo ecclesiastius* (the unusual heading of Article XIV) is distinguished from the more general *ministerium verbi divini* (heading of Article V). The *ordo ecclesiasticus* has always to administer the *ministerium verbi divini*. But not everyone who administers this *ministerium* belongs to the *ordo ecclesiasticus*. Secondly, *Ministerium verbi divini* does not always mean the ordered ministry of the Word, but often, in general, the exercising of the divine Word; or, the service which is done for the church through this exercise, regardless of the person through whom this takes place." [15]

This interpretation confirms the one made by President Koren, in the seventies, already referred to.

---

cating the universal priesthood of believers, said that the word "priest" should be as commonly used as "Christian." The Danish professor also quoted the Copenhagen Articles, the first Danish "Augsburg Confession" (also from 1530): "We believe and teach that we all are Christian priests in "Christ Jesus our eternal priest; that is, such as themselves shall offer to God a living and grateful sacrifice, shall preach and pray. See Clausen, Den Augsburgske Confession, Copenhagen, 181, p. 183.

[12] New York, 1850.

[13] Decorah, Iowa, 1878.

[14] Stockholm, 1906.

[15] Achelis, Lehrbuch der Praktischen Theologie, 3d. ed. I p. 81.

Were There Offices in the Early Church?

As late as 1928 a committee in America recommended that Lutheran synods ordain men to the ministry only after they have been regularly called to the work of the ministry. The reason given was that the Lutheran doctrine of the ministry "based upon the Word of God and confirmed by the practice of the early Church, holds that the ministry is an office and not an order (Augsburg Confession, Article V), and requires that the minister be regularly called (Augsburg Confession, Article XIV).

"An office and not an order!" This sounds familiar. Even the air of finality about it seems familiar. But what does it imply? Does it imply an intelligent understanding of the article in question?

The Catholic Church teaches that the ministers are an *order* (ordo) on a higher level than the lay people (plebs). The Evangelical Church rejects this, but finds no violation of the principles of the Gospel in ordaining a man as a minister and, later, as a bishop, which is the custom in Germany and Scandinavia. For, these two offices are religiously on a par, though they imply different kinds of activity in more or less different fields. With this understanding there would be no objection to speak of orders. Similarly, there would be no religious objection to ordaining a person for a part of that ministry which is generally shouldered by a pastor—call this ordaining or licensing, or setting aside for an order or an office. For, all this implies nothing but a division in the work, for the sake of order and efficiency. The "ordinations" confer no increased *religious grace.* [16]

"The practice of the early Church" is the other ambiguous slogan used by that committee. If church historical research has established anything, it has established the one fact that the early church as a whole had no one-man ministry, or the *office* of the ministry.

Rudolph Sohm has failed to find such a ministry or office at all—in the early Church. He finds functions but not offices; the functions are charismatic.

---

[16] Calvin calls the Protestant ministry an *order* Institutio IV, 3, 1.

Claus Harms chose as motto for his three volumes on pastoral theology: *Serva ordinem et ordo servabit te!* He had a preference for the non "priest" but not in the Catholic meaning. In Protestant Norway and Denmark the minister is called prest=priest, the old pre-Reformation designation has here been retained, but it has gotten a new, evangelical meaning in these countries as has "Priester" in different parts of Protestant Germany.

E. Chr. Achelis, whom none will charge with Romanizing tendencies, defines ordination as the "*Einordnung in den Ordo* (estate) of those who hold the office of the ministry. . . ." Achelis, Lehrbuch der praktischen Theologie, 1911, p. 140.

Martin Schian finds no *Aemter im eigentlichen Sinn. . . in der aeltesten Christenheit.* He speaks of *"Aemter"* (Quotation marks are Schian's) in the Pauline churches. [17]

Karl Mueller, of Tuebingen, finds no offices mentioned in the genuine Pauline epistles. [18]

Sigurd Odland, Norway's foremost conservative exegete, says: "It has been often supposed that it belongs to the essence of the congregation to have a spiritual office, to take care of the ecclesiastical preaching of the Word of God and administration of the sacraments. . . . *But the New Testament knows nothing about such an office.* Indeed there are frequently mention of 'elders' or 'bishops' (also called 'shepherds', 'leaders' or 'rulers') who were either appointed by the Apostles or chosen by the congregation itself. But they had, as such, nothing to do with preaching. Their task was that of leading: . . . caring for certain arrangements as to gatherings for worship, conducting economic affairs pertaining to the congregation. . . . But ecclesiastical preaching was not attached to any permanent office, but depended on charisms, operating freely. Any man, who was a member of the congregation, if he had the needed gifts could speak at the gatherings as prophet, or as teacher or as exhorter—of course, under the presupposition that the congregation recognized that he possessed some of these gifts of grace. . . . The spiritual office, as we know it, is something that developed gradually in the course of the second century, due to the existing circumstances." [19]

In a recent work by Knopf-Lietzmann-Weinel the claim is made that the teachers of the early Church were not elected, but were called by the Spirit. [20] This work also states that the local churches did not have as leaders *"eingesetzte Amtstraeger"*. Therefore the letters of the Apostle (Paul) are always addressed to the congregations as totalities. Also many detail observations in these leters show that there was *no office* in the congregations, which supervised them and was responsible for them. [21]

Notwithstanding, "powers that be" persistently harp on the existence of offices in the early Church and discriminate finely between order and office, perpetuating the art of the theological pedants who in the days of Jesus strained the gnat, camelum autem glutientes.

---

[17] M. Schian, Grundriss der praktischen Theologie, 1924.

[18] Karl Mueller, Kirchengeschichte, 1924, pp. 110 seq.

[19] Quotation from Ludvig Hope, Kyrkja og Guds Folk, Bergen 1923, pp. 121, seq.

[20] Knopf. . . Einfuehrung in das Neue Testament, 1923, p. 300.

[21] Ibid, 329.

The Public Ministry as such is not de jure divino

The ablest comentator on the Augsburg Confession, in modern times, especially in its bearing on polity is Rudolf Sohm, to whom we have referred several times. Most illuminating is his Kirchenrecht I (1893) and II (1923 posthumous). Here he reaches the conclusion that "Das oeffentliche *Predigtamt ist fuer Luther weltliches Predigtamt (gehoert zu dem 'aeusserlichen Wesen'), ist jure divino* (geistlich) *entbehrlich: nichts 'Goettliches' noch 'Halbgoettliches' liegt darin.*"[22]

This view of Luther, so fittingly expressed by Sohm, was crowded back due to circumstances of which Luther was not master. The Lutheran Church in its organization became "too much an institution directed by technical officials, in the name of God." State churchism and the effects of the thirty years war were adverse factors.

There came a time when the clergy, subject to the whims of patrons and arbitrariness of governments, since they did not know how long they could serve a community or continue as pastors, found their support in the "divineness of the preaching office." The evangelical conception that the highest calling is to be a Christian, and that man's best support is always to do ones Christian duty had to recede for the self-made consolation of divine officialdom. This view was proclaimed in all possible ways by contemporary theologians: "The ministers are on the same line with the prophets and apostles, they are to reveal God's Word and counsel to men." "The preaching office is the best office; so much better than the secular office as the soul is better than the body." Princes had to appear, head uncovered, before their courtpreacher.[23] The minister, when invited to dine, had the right to bring with him his wife and his children, and take the chief seat at the table, drink from his own mug. At his departure, the mug was duly filled and he took it home.

Pietism was a reaction against Orthodoxy, and, by stressing the universal priesthood of believers, paved the way for a more evangelical conception of the ministry. The Age of Illumination lost sight entirely of the business of a minister and made him a publicity man for progress movements.

In the nineteenth century many a new work on pastoral theology saw the light of day. Harms used Catholic designations in his work on this subject, but interpreted them in the evangelical sense. The Neo-Lutherans followed, of whom mention has been made before. They did not always avoid Romanizing lines, spe-

[22] Sohm, Kirchenrecht II, p. 141.

[23] Hermann Werdermann, Der evangelische Pfarrer 1925, p. 30.

cially when they entertained views hard by sacramental ordination or magic.

A return to the evangelical conception was noted in Nitzsch's *Praktische Theologie* and Chr. Palmer's *Ev. Pastoral Theologie.* Palmer rejects the idea that "the office of the ministry has received a special divine authority through a special divine institution; he also opposes the teaching that the individual who holds this office, is positively certain that such an authority has been imparted to him. [24]

Leopold Wittekindt, later a leader of the *Gemeinschafts* movement, relates that he had made a comprehensive study of Villmar's Pastoral Theology, with its high church idea of the ministry. He had also accepted Villmar's view on the church. He saw in his pastorate a continuation of the apostolate. Later, parting from these views, he said, in making a retrospection; In those days, the office did not feel like a burden. He felt elevated by it. Then he used the goad of the driver on the people. But his congrgation did not show much understanding of this. He became more and more lonesome in its midst. "A holy wrath" took possession of him. He showed a certain harshness in his sermons. Later he saw that this was the way to close all doors upon him. Gradually, by studying the Bible zealously, he perceived the difference between law and gospel. [25]

Dr. Otto Kirn, professor of systematic Theology in Leipzig held the same view. "Even the most important office that the evangelical church knows, the office of preaching (the ministry) is *not* regarded by her as an immediate divine institution, but as a matter of good and purposeful order." [26]

Dr. Karl Girgensohn, likewise professor in Leipzig, taught that the organization of the church, including the ministry, is indeed necessary but is a *human work.* [27]

Dr. Reinhold Seeberg, of Berlin, teaches that the offices in the church did not exist from the start, but originated in subsequent times. [28]

Eminent scholars in the field of practical theology like E. Chr. Achelis, G. Rietschel, Franz Rendtorff have championed the evangelical conception, over against the Neo-Lutheran claims, and have, in this respect, a following perhaps of the great majorities of the Protestant clergy in Germany.

---

[24] Werdemann, Ibid. 105.
[25] Ibid. p. 106.
[26] Kirn, Grundriss der Evangelischen Dogmatik 3d ed. p. 132.
[27] Girgensohn, Ethik (edited by Dr. Carl Schneider), 1926, p. 56.
[28] R. Seeberg, Ethik 2 ed. p. 146; Dogmatik, 1925, II. p. 460.

To conclude the argument, let us consult Bishop A. Ostenfeld of Denmark: "I have never been able to grasp, and I cannot find in the New Testament, the viewpoint of the office of the ministry as having a special authority from God—not even in the toned-down form as something special within the congregation. The minister is the elder of the congregation. He has received the special task of being a proclaimer of the gospel and a shepherd for souls—and this for the sake of order. It is possible that some of my readers do not agree with me in this low church theory. But this is of no consequence." Thus a Lutheran bishop of outstanding piety and scholarship, in harmony with all the other scholars we have been listing. [29]

To be continued

[29] H. Ostenfeld, Arbeidslyst og Arbeidsmod i Menigheden, Copenhagen, 1911, p. 116.

AN IMPORTANT MISSIONARY DEVELOPMENT OF THE EARLY EIGHTIES

PAUL A. MENZEL

There are in existence three volumes of a monthly periodical entitled "Der Missionar," issued in 1881, 1882 and 1883.

The purpose, as stated in the January editorial of 1881, was—"Es moechte naemlich fuer die Evangelische Synode von Nord Amerika ein bestaendiger Mahner sein, des Rechtes, der Pflicht zu gedenken, welche sie hat, selbststaendig Heidenmission zu treiben"—"Serving as a constant monitor to the Evangelical Synod, to bear in mind the right and the duty of carrying on independent mission work."

The missionary contributions of the Evangelical Synod for 1880 are enumerated under the following headings:

Basel Mission Society	$2,970.00
Barmen (Rhenish Mission Society)	1,405.00
New York Mission Society	560.00
Gossner Society	195.00
Bremen	138.00
Various other Societies	232.00
Total	$5,500.00

It is pointed out that this is not as small a sum as it may appear. In 1829 the Barmen Society, with four missionaries, had an income of 25,000 Marks, a little over $6,000; in 1833 the Scotch established Church reported to Dr. Duff through Dr. Inglis, when the third missionary was being sent, "The church can now count on a yearly income of about $5,800;" the Lutheran General Council with three American and two Indian workers had an income of $5,800. This was considered proof that the Evangelical Synod ought to embark on its own enterprise. "Every church ought to occupy its own post."

In May, 1883 Rev. Albert Zeller takes exception to a circular letter of the Basel Mission House (A. Kinzler) that it would be a mistake if the friends in America added another Society, necessitating repetition of old mistakes in gaining missionary experience, etc. . . "In our missionary publicity and at our missionary festivals we ought not to shine continually with the borrowed moonlight of the labor of grace and salvation and experiences of other missionary circles. Now that our own forces number some thirty thousand or more members, inclusive of our pastors, let us stop standing idly in the market place, but even at the eleventh hour heed the call of our Master: Go ye also into my vineyard. Are there not in our midst pastors, candidates and theological students,

and loving parents and mothers in our congregations whom the Lord would find ready if He said to them: "Separate unto me this or that one, unto the work unto which I have called them?"

"Thus it is my desire that our Evangelical Church, in humble readiness and joyful believing hope, await the day, when He may also put us to use in missionary service, and when ever more fully the deeply felt desire of our own hearts and wills may find expression, whenever we say: 'Thy Kingdom come.'"

Friends at home had to be convinced of their ability to finance a work of their own. For this reason, in June, 1881, a detailed financial statement of the cost of the Lutheran Rajamundri Mission was reprinted, with the recapitulation:

Running expenses, as such	$4,231.00
Cost of a Mission building	1,290.00
Total	$6,521.00

The writer draws the deduction: "Our Synod is raising $6,500 a year for Foreign Missions, somewhat more than that is required in the Lutheran Field for running expenses, *and we have no field of our own.*"

Serious objections had to be met. Apart from the question as to cost, the other was raised: Where will you get missionaries? Very frankly it is conceded: "Without missionaries no mission is possible;" but the hope also is expressed, "as soon as our Synod seriously recognize her obligation and resolves to fulfil it, the workers will certainly be found. Even at the persent time three young Brethren of our Seminary are willing, after completing their training, to enter foreign service as soon as the Synod decides to take it up. Even if for some reason none of these three can ever go, we will not lack suitable laborers if we foster the mission spirit. Missionaries are available,—see to it that they are sent."

The paper itself, by November, offered subscriptions for 1882 at reduced rates,—30c per single copy, 50 copies for $9.00, and 100 copies at $15.00, 8 pages quarto. The editor was the Rev. Conrad Bechtold, business manager Mr. A. G. Toennies, 1327 Exchange St., St. Louis.

The closing issue (December) brought a strong editorial in line with the dominating purpose of the publication, under the caption:

"Why ought Our Synod Begin a Foreign Work of Its Own?"

The argumentation proved vigorous and convincing.

1. The Christian Church as a whole, and all Christians in general, are endowed with the right and the duty of publishing the Gospel among the heathen.

2. We conceive our Synod to be not only a motley aggregate of believers, but a *Church* among others of this country, providentially called into existence and endowed with gifts and powers, indicating her duty to assist in the upbuilding and perfection of the Kingdom.

3. This represents a solidary responsibility. Obeying the missionary commission of the Lord can never be considered a private duty of a few, but must be the general obligation of the church as a whole.

4. The parable of the entrusted pounds proves plainly the duty of the individual. Could we be considered "trading with our pound," if we turned our offerings into the treasuries of the older Mission Societies? Do we not immediately see the unworthiness of the proceedure? It was suggested as an expedient only to the slothful servant, unwilling to do, for himself, his full duties.

5. There is no "lawful" claim of the Basel and Barmen Societies upon the missionary aid of our church. If that were true, every other Society which has furnished the Synod ministers would share in the same claim.

6. Consequently it is but right and desirable that the Synod employ the missionary contribution of its churches, *in the establishing of a Mission of our own.*

1882

This line of argumentation was continued in the opening issue of 1882, by meeting at the same time a number of objections which evidently had been voiced in the controversy engendered. That controversy had found its able exponent and literary form of expression in another monthly publication the "Evangelischer Missionsfreund." Rev. Bechtold continued the editorial of the preceding month by maintaining:

1. Whatever is in God's will always proves to be wise and blessed. Such blessing rests upon all churches engaging in missionary effort. Missionary congregations are the ones showing the most spiritual life.

2. What right have we to expect our own membership, growing up and already to a large extent born in the United States, to show the same interest in work administered abroad which they would have in an enterprise of their home church?

3. Why should a church like our own, counting some 26,000 heads of families, be warned of the "unwisdom" of an independent missionary enterprise? Do we deplore the mission work of the Moravians as an act of unwisdom?

4. We are to refrain from adding another "second-hand" Mission Society, and thus engaging in a further scattering of our

forces. Let us, on our own part, make a plea for unity and unification—come and unite with us! We are living on our own side of the ocean and have established our independence denominationally; now, dropping all petty partisanship in our own ranks, let us show a united front in the fulfilment of our missionary duty.

And a third time the question is taken up in the second issue of the year, February, 1882. *Why ought our Synod begin a Foreign work of its own?*—This time the reply is concluded in the bold claim—

Because we are lacking in neither the means nor the men. Like all other missions we have to live by faith, and like the disciples of old, if we only take the Lord by His word, will find that we always shall be able to reply to his question "Lacked ye anything?" Nothing.—He has promised to be with us. His is both silver and gold.

Yet it is advisable to count the cost before building a tower. But even in this respect, as far as visible assets are concerned, we are better off than, for instance, the Schleswig Holstein Mission which has recently called its first two workers for India, before any part of the thousand dollars necessary to send them is in its hands. That is dependent on the response to a special call, which however is given out in faith.

In our own Synod mission contributions have risen from $3,700 in 1877 to $7,900 in 1881—the amount being doubled in five years. Including gifts for Home missions (synodical and otherwise) the total offered for extension of the Kingdom amounted to $10,979.32. And the deduction is made—the missionary urge actually existent within the Synod, is seeking for an outlet and a definite project; if it thus manifests without definite stimulus and guidance, how much more can be expected when these are provided—Foreign societies are not after our men but only after our money. Both ought to be utilized by ourselves. *If we see to it that even one-half of the present year's missionary contributions is set aside for a distinctively synodical enterprise, the first two missionaries of our own can leave for the foreign field by next year.*

And still another time the plea was made the following month. The argumentation deepened. It was fortified by Scriptural quotation and deduction, by statistical and historical proof. Evidently the editors heart had been stirred and his conviction strengthened by what had come to him through conversation and correspondence, and the March article closed with the statement:

"Though the inauguration of a Mission of our own may entail labor and hardship—all the richer will be the blessing flowing back thereby directly upon our church. For—whosoever hath, unto him shall be given, that he may have the more abundant."

The question already looms up as to *where* the Synod might begin the work, and a lengthy editorial is devoted to the pro and con of a mission among the North American Indians, resulting finally in the advice, to leave that work to existing societies and, rather, to consider some aboriginal tribe like the Gonds of India.

In May "Der Missionar" reports, through one of the pastors, the promise of an anonymous church member, to assist in the commissioning of the first synodical missionary by gift of $200. And the pastor adds that the offer is made by a person of scanty means.

From that time on Rev. R. Wobus of St. Charles, Mo., acted as special treasurer, and members of the Synod are urged by "Der Missionar" to send him their missionary contributions, designating their gifts for the "Synodical Foreign Mission."

During 1882 the project of rebuilding the Theological Seminary of Marthasville, Mo., at St. Louis, began to take shape, and the friends of the mission project advocated it as another step forward in the realization of their own plan. Instead of holding the latter in abeyance, however, for the time being, till the Seminary should have been built and paid for, they argued: The more we make of our mission festivals and mission offerings, the more even the Seminary will be benefited. For both Seminary and Home Mission projects receive their chief support through the attractive character given the mission festivals by the foreign aspect of the work. A voluntary Mission Society had already been organized, and membership in the same was solicited, applications to be addressed either to the editor of Der Missionar, or Prof. C. Kunzmann of Femme Osage, Mo., or Rev. R. Wobus of St. Charles, Mo.

In announcing his willingness to join the Society and to organize a local auxiliary, an unnamed pastor thus formulated his reasons: "Heretofore I favored sending our mission monies to Barmen and Basel—but the recent call published in the Theologische Zeitschrift "Eine Brennende Frage" seems to point out the right direction. Assisting Societies abroad is, after all, a cheap way of appearing to pay off an obligation which ought to be assumed in full. And it can only be assumed in full by means of a synodical Mission. Real faith life must seek to attain its aims by the direct route."

Besides the call mentioned here another was published direct in "Der Missionar" in November. The need of a Synodical Mission was stressed by referring to the "younger Christians born in our own midst who are growing up in ignorance of the mission cause. This can be counteracted only if our church begins its own work abroad, and for this purpose the undersigned pastors and teachers have banded together as a Mission Society, with the aim of inaugurating independent work in the spirit of the Evangelical Synod and

PACIFIC SCHOOL

according to her doctrinal and life principles, as soon as the necessary means shall be at hand."—The signatures were the following: Kunzmann, Galster, Zeller, Stamer, Hoefer, W. Beck, Woelfle, Ritzmann, Kramer, H. Wolf, G. Doernenburg, J. J. Fink, Fuendeling, Bechtold.

A month later the closing announcement of the year gave the result of the election of a Board of Managers (Verwaltungsrat)—Bechtold, W. Beck, Hoefer, Kunzmann, Stamer, R. Wobus.

1883

Up to this time the heading of "Der Missionar" had carried the name of the Rev. C. Bechtold as publisher and editor. And the publisher, as we were told personally, had borne the usual burdens and gone to the many sacrifices in the financing of the project. From now on the "Mission Society in the Evangelical Syond of North America" (Missionsgesellschaft in der Evangelischen Synode von Nord Amerika) acted as publisher. New members were announced from month to month, and further encouragement was found in a further growth of missionary gifts, totalling for 1882 throughout the Synod:

For Foreign Work	$ 6,298.09
Missions in catholic countries	719.54
Missions among Jews	163.07
Home Missions (synodical)	4,442.14
Home Missions (non-synodical)	168.50
Total	$11,591.34

In the first sum (foreign work) the New York Society participated with a total of $1225.79. This is the "German Evangelical Mission Society in the United States" which, a few months later, got into very close touch with the Synod, by offering its Chhattisgargh Mission in India as a gift to the Synod, and thus helping the latter to realize its goal of an independent synodical Mission. The 1882 contributions, as compared with the years before, represented a decrease of $810 in gifts for Foreign Missions, but a considerable increase for Home work. The editor points out that there ought to be added, besides, to the latter $1736.38 given in aid of mission churchbuilding projects. And if, furthermore, the contributions to the St. Louis orphanages and the Good Samaritan Hospital were taken into account, the Friedensbote had recorded a total of $18,-109.20 for Home Missions. The "ceterum censeo" however is added —"If only one-half of the gifts for Foreign Missions and missions among Catholics and Jews ($7180.70) were set apart, our contemplated Synodical Mission could be made a reality."

The Synodical Society now announced its first general meet-

ing, in connection with the General Conference of the IV District, at Quincy, Ill., the church of the Rev. L. Nollau, April 12, Thursday afternoon, preceding the opening of Conference. At that meeting the following day, April 13th, a constitution was adopted, the principal paragraphs of which are reprinted in the May issue, paragraph 2 reading "The Society considers itself an integral part of the Evangelical Synod, and shares with her in the confessional views expressed in paragraph 2 of the Synodical constitution." The governing Board was enlarged to include three laymen with the six pastors and teachers. It seems the other District Conferences of 1883 did not take favorable action relative to the aims of the Society. A Pastoral Conference, however, that of Indianapolis, took out membership in a body (Pastors C. F. Reller, Chr. Peters, F. F. Mayer, R. Mueller), and from month to month the accession of further members was recorded. By the month of August the following officers had been elected: Pres. H. Hoefer, Higginsville, Mo.; V. Pres., C. Bechtold; Sec., H. Stamer; Treas., R. Wobus.

Meanwhile the rumor gained currency that the interdenominational "German Evangelical Missionary Society in the United States" contemplated offering its Chhattisgarh Mission in India to the Evangelical Synod. "What ought to be our policy" asks the editor, "if this should come to pass?"—The warning is given out, not to consent to any half-way measures, with regard to Foreign Missions, at the time of the impending General Conference. Some people must have advocated solving the synodical controversy by appointing a commission for the annual distribution of all missionary offerings among the several Societies abroad. To this the editor objects vigorously. "In line with the policy of our Society we can only be satisfied with the establishment of a mission work which is to be our own and which fully merits the name of Synodical Work. Nothing less will do. And the members of our Society attending the General Conference must stand by this principle. If the Chhattisgarh Mission should be offered as an outright gift, we would deem the acceptance of this work as in line with our policy, and we advise our members to vote for it. A synodical mission is a vital question for us."

And behold—within a few weeks the editorial for November was written under the heading:

The Decision of the General Conference

The Conference had been convened at St. Peters, St. Louis. Pastors Geyer (Dutch Reformed) and Theodore Dresel (Evangelical Synod), acting as delegates of the German Evangelical Mission Society in the United States, had made the definite and un-

conditional offer of transferring the latter's work in Chhattisgarh Central India, with two Stations at Bisrampur and Raipur and their misionaries Oscar Lohr and Andrew Stoll, to the Synod. The Conference, on its own part, had appointed pastors Shory, Philip Goebel, Kampmeier, Tanner, Haeberle and two congregational delegates, as a committee on special resolutions in the matter. The 29th of October brought the decision. In spite of a heavy indebtedness of the Synod, occasioned by the building of Eden Seminary, and the fear and misgivings of the more timid ones, it was decided, after special prayer by the Rev. J. Irion, to accept the offer of the G. E. M. S. in the U. S. A., assuming all of its rights as well as all of its obligations.

Sooner than even the most sanguine had dared to hope, the Synod had embarked, or rather had providentially been led to embark, on a "mission work of its own," coming even into the inheritance of an already established Mission.

The special mission of "Der Missionar" had thus found its fulfillment. The resolutions adopted October 29th, among other things, provided for the taking over of the Chhattisgarh work by the Synod; the administration by a mixed commission of nine, three of whom to be representatives of the Synod assuming office in 1884, and three others added for each of the next two years, each time replacing directors of the "G. E. M. S. in the U. S.", and thus putting the Synod, after three years, in full control of the administration. The two synodical publications "Der Missionar" and "Der Evangelische Missionsfreund" were merged into the "Deutscher Missionsfreund," the former publication of the New York Society. The Rev. Albert Thiele of St. Louis was to be the new editor. A committee of three—Prof. Kunzmann, Rev. John Huber and Rev. C. Kranz, were entrusted with the negotiations of transfer, to be completed in connection with and at the time of the next annual meeting of the G. E. M. G. in May, 1884.

The above resolutions were heartily endorsed, while the General Conference was still in session, by the Board of Directors of the Synodical Mission Society, and all funds of the Society as well as subscription lists, cuts of "Der Missionar" were offered the new venture, pending the ratification of the transfer of the Chhattisgarh Mission. The Synodical Society remained intact and continued its activities until that transfer was completed, serving all the more joyfully, since its labors now directly aided the independent Synodical Mission at which it had aimed all along.

Once again private enterprise had proven the means of causing the official church to assume her mission duty.

MODERN BIBLE TRANSLATIONS AND THEIR PROBLEMS

H. J. Schick, S.T.D.

Modern Bible translators have at their command a multitude of manuscripts and a reliable source of definite knowledge which was not at the disposal of the King James translators of 1611, and which is also far beyond the English Revision of 1885 and the American Revision of 1901. The modern scholars have profited by the recent discoveries, explorations and investigations which have produced a purer Biblical text and have thrown new light upon "dark sayings" of the Scriptures. Prominent among the modern scholars who have translated the Bible, or parts thereof, into English are Dr. J. M. P. Smith, asisted by Dr. A. R. Gordon, Dr. T. J. Meek and Dr. L. Waterman; Dr. James Moffatt, Dr. Richard Weymouth and Dr. Edgar Goodspeed. Without a doubt their translations are more accurate and consistent than any previous translation. They are the product of the best of modern scholarship on the basis of the latest discoveries. Nevertheless, the modern translators of the Bible must still cope with many problems. Some have been solved with remarkable ingenuity; others are still unsolved. It is the purpose of this article to point out some of these problems of Bible translation and to compare the efforts made towards their solution by the different translators.

We shall be obliged, at the very outset, to pass by the many difficulties and problems which the traditional or "massoretic" text produces. The original text is in many instances uncertain, defective and corrupt. The J and E narratives, their fusion about a century later, the numerous editorial additions and interpolations, and sometimes a certain carelessness in arranging the material causing omissions or displacement of passages present problems of their own to the modern translators. But even with a sound text the translation into English of scriptures written by Oriental minds and primarily for Oriental people has social, religious, and psychological problems which are not easily solved.

One of the problems facing the translators of the Old Testament is the treatment of the divine name. So far as we know the Hebrews called their deity by the name of "Yahweh" (יהוה). When in the course of time this name was regarded as too sacred for utterance they substituted for it the Hebrew word for "Lord" (אדני). When vowels were added to the text, the consonants of "Yahweh" were given the vowels of "Lord." In the fourteenth century Christian scholars, ignorant of this usage, took the vowels, and consonants exactly as they were written and produced the artificial name "Jehavah" (יְהֹוָה).

Dr. Smith in his translation of the Old Testament follows the orthodox Jewish tradition and substitutes "the Lord" for the name "Yahweh," and the phrase "the Lord God" for the phrase "the Lord Yahweh." In cases where "Lord" or "God" represents an original "Yahweh," small capitals are employed thus permitting those readers who desire to retain the flavor of the original text to read "Yahweh" where "Lord" or "God" occurs. Dr. J. Moffatt follows the practice of French scholars and of Matthew Arnold in translating "Yahweh" as "the Eternal," except in an enigmatic title like "the Lord of hosts."

The following example will help illustrate the different translations of Yahweh, and also show the different style of the translators. In Genesis 2: 15 we read in the *Revised Version:* "And Jehovah God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it."

Dr. Smith: "The Lord God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to till it and to look after it."

Dr. Moffatt: "God the Eternal took man and put him in the park of Eden, to till it and to guard it."

The Revised Version translates Genesis 3: 22: And Jehovah God said: "Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil."

Dr. Smith: Then the Lord God said: "See, the man has become like one of us, in knowing good from evil."

Dr. Moffatt: "Then said God the Eternal, Man has become like one of us, he knows good and evil."

Baffling to the translator is the Hebrew habit of playing upon words, acrostics, euphemisms, paranomasia and verbal tropes. In Micah 1: 10, 11, 13, 14 we have an outstanding example which Dr. Moffatt renders masterfully:

"Weep tears at Teartown (Bochim),
Grovel in the dust at Dustown (Beth-ophrah),
Fare forth stripped, O Fairtown (Saphir)!
Stirtown (Zaanan) dare not stir,—
Harness your steeds and away,
O Horsetown (Lakhish),—
Israel's Kings are ever balked
At Balkton (Achzib).—

Unique and keen as the above rendition is, we cannot help think that Dr. Moffatt strained a point when he attempted the following: "Lemech became the father of a son, whom he called Noah, saying, "Now we shall *'know a'* relief from our labor and from our toil on the ground that the Eternal cursed." (Gen. 5: 29).

It strikes us furthermore as an oddity when Dr. Moffatt translates Luke 10: 41, 42 in the story of Jesus visit with Mary and Martha of Bethany,—"Martha, Martha, Mary has chosen the best dish, and she is not to be dragged away from it." In a foot-note Dr. Moffatt explains that he translates μερίδα by dish "to bring out the point and play of the saying. Jesus means that Mary has chosen well in selecting the nourishment of his teaching."

Certain characteristic Hebrew terms have no English equivalent which corresponds to their original meaning. Take, for example, the names of coins and amounts of money. In the parable recorded Luke 19: 11 ff, the Greek word for the amount of money given by the nobleman to his servants is δέκα μνᾶς which had an approximate value of twenty-dollars. How shall it be rendered in English? It is interesting to note how the different versions, old and modern, have sought to solve the difficulty, and how time and nationality have influenced their solutions. The Authorized Version says of the nobleman, "he called his ten servants and delivered them ten pounds."—The old version said "pounds," because that was in 1611 the large unit of money in England. The American Revised Version which appeared in 1901 states: "he gave them ten pounds," but in a footnote makes the following enigmatical explanation: "Mina, here translated a pound, is equal to one hundred drachmas." Dr. Moffatt astonishes us with the assertion that the nobleman gave to each of his servants "a five-pound note," just as if the Bank of England were operating in Jesus' day. Dr. Goodspeed as a loyal American pictures the nobleman as calling in ten of his "slaves" and giving each twenty dollars. Dr. Weymouth permits each servant to retain a pound apiece, but in a foot-note calls attention to the value of the money. It seems to the writer that the point of the parable is not so much the amount and value of the money given, but the faithfulness of its use and subsequent reward. Why not then translate μνᾶς simply as "a sum of money?"

In the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10: 35) Dr. Moffatt describes the benefactor as taking out "a couple of shillings" and giving them to the inn-keeper. Dr. Goodspeed says, "he took out a dollar and gave it to the inn-keeper." But if we are to modernize the story, why not quote a sum approximating present hotel-rates? Neither a couple of shillings or a dollar would go very far in these days.

How shall the Greek phrase „διὰ τῶν σπορίμων" in Matthew 12: 1 be translated? Various versions render; "through the corn," "through the grain-fields," "through the corn-fields," "through the wheatfields." The translation "corn" and "corn-

fields" makes the average American reader think of maize, or Indian Corn, and it is puzzling to him that the disciples should pluck the ears of corn and forthwith eat them. The translation "wheatfields" is much better, but not an exact translation, as the Greek word is a general term for grain. It might be wheat or barley. Just as likely, it was the latter. A comparison of the translations of Matthew 12: 1 is very interesting, not only in regard to the phrase just mentioned, but also in regard to other words in the same verse. Here are various versions: (The italics are the writer's)

Authorized Version: "At that time Jesus *went* on the Sabbath day *through the corn;* and his disciples were *a hungered,* and began to *pluck the ears of corn, and to eat.*"

Revised Version: "At that *season* Jesus went on the sabbath day through the *grainfields;* and his disciples *were hungry* and began to pluck *ears* and to eat."

Dr. Moffatt: "At that time Jesus *walked one* sabbath through the *cornfields,* and *as* his disciples were hungry *they started to pull some ears of corn* and eat them."

Dr. Weymouth: "*About* that time Jesus *passed* on the Sabbath through the *wheatfields,* and His disciples *became hungry,* and began *to gather ears of wheat* and eat them.

Dr. Goodspeed: "At that *same* time Jesus walked one Sabbath through the wheat fields, and his disciples became hungry and began *to pick the heads of wheat* and eat them."

How are references to Hebraic social customs to be translated into English? In New Testament times people did not *sit* at a table to eat, but *reclined* on couches arranged around the table. Shall this custom be boldly announced to readers, or shall it be suppressed? In Luke 7: 36 ff. we read the story of Simon the Pharisee inviting Jesus to eat with him. The Authorized Version states of Jesus that he "sat down to meat," but leaves the readers in the dark as to the manner in which the sinful woman stood at his feet behind him, washing his feet with tears and wiping them with the hairs of her head, when apparently, if Jesus was sitting down, his feet must have been under the table. The Revised Version says, "sat down to meat," and then in foot-note No. 12 mentions, "reclined at table." Dr. Goodspeed very nicely evades the horns of the dilemma by stating that Jesus "took his place at the table." *Dr. Weymouth and Dr. Moffatt* render the original literally by saying of Jesus that "he reclined at table."

How closely shall the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, or the text of H. von Soden of Berlin be followed? Dr. Goodspeed states in his introduction to his American translation of the New

Testament that he departed from Westcott and Hort, notably in the rendition of the famous passage in 1 Peter 3: 19. Here he adopts the striking suggestion of Dr. Rendel Harris that by an error of the eye on the part of some scribe the name of Enoch has dropped out of the text. Dr. Moffatt who follows the text of H. von Soden, also accepts the emendation of Dr. Harris that Ἐνὼχ has been omitted after ἐν ᾧ καὶ (ΕΝΩΚΑΙ [ΕΝΩΧ]) by "a scribe's blunder in dropping some repeated letters." Thus Dr. Moffatt translates the passage: "It was in the Spirit that Enoch also went and preached to the imprisoned spirits who had disobeyed at the time when God's patience held out during the construction of the Ark in the days of Noah—" The Authorized and Revised Versions assert that it was Jesus who in the spirit went and preached unto the spirits in prison. On the basis of this latter rendition the "Apostolic Creed" asserts, "he descended into hell." But suppose the eminent Doctors Harris, Moffatt and Goodspeed are right?—

Shall translators be mindful of modern ideas of delicacy and veil the imagery or the plain speech of the Oriental? The writer need not refer to certain Old Testament sex stories, but calls attention to a passage found in the Gospel-reading for Oculi Sunday, Luke 11: 27. The Authorized Version translates boldly and bluntly: "Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the paps which thou hast sucked." The Revised Version endeavors to tone it down somewhat by stating: "Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the breasts which thou didst suck." Dr. Weymouth attempts further veiling of the plain speech by translating: "Blessed is the mother who carried you, and the breasts you have sucked." Dr. Moffatt follows closely the Revised Version. Dr. Goodspeed alone handles the subject without giving offense: "Blessed is the mother who bore you and nursed you."

How shall the word γύναι and the subsequent phrase in John 2: 4 and John 19: 26, 27 be rendered so that it does not sound repellent or disrespectful? No doubt, it was uttered in a tone and with a gesture befitting the loving and tender nature of Jesus. Yet a certain harshness clings to the translation which no doubt was not in the mind of Jesus. Let us note how the modern translators have grappled with the problem:

Dr. Moffatt: "As the wine ran short, the mother of Jesus said to him, "They have no wine." "Woman," said Jesus, "what have you to do with me? My time has not come yet."

Dr. Goodspeed: "The wine gave out, and Jesus' mother said to him, "They have no more wine!" Jesus said to her, "Do not try to direct me. It is not yet time for me to act."

Dr. Weymouth: "Now the wine ran short; whereupon, the mother of Jesus said to Him, "They have no wine." "Leave it to me," he replied; "my hour has not yet come."

The reader will note that both Dr. Goodspeed and Dr. Weymouth omit translating γύναι in order not to jeopardize the spirit of the passage by clinging too closely to the text, and a difficult text at that. Passing on to John 19: 26, 27, the Third Word on the Cross, we see a procedure similar to the one above.

Dr. Moffatt: "So when Jesus saw his mother and his favorite disciple standing near, he said to his mother, "Woman, there is your son!" Then he said to the disciple, "And there is your mother!"

Dr. Goodspeed: So Jesus, seeing his mother and the disciple whom he loved standing near, said to his mother, "There is your son!" Then he said to his disciple, "There is your mother!"

Dr. Weymouth: "So Jesus, seeing his mother, and seeing the disciple whom he loved standing near, said to his mother, "Look, your son!" Then said he to the disciple, "Look, your mother!"

Shall translators inject their theological opinions into the text? In Luke 22: 19 we read in the Revised Version: "This is my body which is given for you." However, Dr. Moffatt translates: "This means my body given up for your sake." If Dr. Moffatt is right in thus interpreting the pasage all further arguments for transubstantiation and consubstantiation are at once and for all time nullified.—

In the famous Logos-passage of John 1: 1ff, the word θεός is translated "God." Thus the Revised Version and Dr. Weymouth: "The Word was God." But Dr. Moffatt and Dr. Goodspeed translate θεός "divine." "The Logos was divine" (Moffatt). "The Word was divine" (Goodspeed). Why should in one case θεός mean "divine," and in every other case, "God"?

Let us examine another instance of questionable interpretation. The Greek word ὑπάρχω means "to be by nature." It occurs about sixty times in the New Testament. In every one of these cases it means simply, "to be." But when the word appears in the great passage of the humiliation and exaltation of Jesus (Phil. 2: 6 ff.), the word ὑπάρχων seems suddenly to change its meaning, and the phrase ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ is more or less ignored. The literal translation of the passage is: "Who being in the form of God," or, "who being by nature in the form of God." Dr. Moffatt, Dr. Weymouth and Dr. Goodspeed omit the words "in the form." Dr. Mof-

fatt says: "Though he was divine by nature." Dr. Weymouth:—"he had the nature of God." Dr. Goodspeed: "Though he possessed the nature of God."—The Revised Version remains in this instance truer to the original text by translating, "who existing in the form of God."

The above are some of the many problems confronting the translator of the Bible. Verily he soon learns humility. He cannot help but feel the inadequacy of his work. But he lives in hope. To quote one of them: "We can but hope that we have not fallen too far short of the summit of perfection; and that our work may at least serve as a stepping-stone toward those greater translations which time will surely bring." (Dr. Smith in his preface to "The Old Testament, An American Translation"). And, no doubt, excellent as the new translations are and far better than any that have preceded them, yet in the course of time still better ranslaions will appear. But whether any translation will adequately bring the thought of the far-off world and age of the Bible to the modern occidental mind is a question which only time will answer.

Die Naturwissenschaft im Verhältnis zum christlichen Erhaltungs-, Vorsehungs- und Wunderglauben.

Von Professor Dr. Grützmacher.

I. Vorsehungs- und Erhaltungsglaube.

Unmittelbarer noch und lebendiger als der Schöpfungsglaube ist der Erhaltungs- und Vorsehungsglaube mit der gegenwärtigen und praktischen Religiosität des Christen verknüpft. Fährt doch Luther in seinem Bekenntnis zum Glauben, daß Gott ihn geschaffen hat, mit dem Satz fort: „Und noch erhält und mit aller Notdurft dieses Leibes und Lebens reichlich und täglich versorgt." Denn der Christ führt den Fortbestand der Welt ebenso unmittelbar auf Gott zurück, wie ihre Entstehung. Nicht die Natur und ihre Gesetzlichkeit tragen im letzten Grund den Weltbestand, sondern die allgegenwärtige und beharrende Gotteskraft. Im Sinne des Psalmisten, der alle Tiere sofort sterben läßt, wenn Gott seinen Odem zurückzieht, glaubt der religiöse Mensch sein und aller Wesen Leben bedingt durch die erhaltende und tragende Macht des göttlichen Geistes. Diese Erhaltung aber trägt nicht einen uninteressierten und gleichgültigen Charakter, sondern sie ist wie die Erhaltung von Kindern durch ihre Eltern mit Liebe und Fürsorge verbunden. **Die Erhaltung ist zugleich Vorsehung** — diesen Begriff nicht in erster Linie im Sinn einer auf die Zukunft bedachten Handlung verstanden, sondern als „Fürsehung," das heißt als eine fürsorgliche Behandlung zu unserm Besten. Die Erhaltung der Welt und ihres gesamten Bestandes wird vom Christen als eine Leistung Gottes gedeutet, die ihm zugute kommen soll. Der Christ glaubt an eine „providentia specialissima" im Sinn von Paul Gerhardts Lied: „Er wird auch Wege finden, da dein Fuß gehen kann." Stange sagt darum mit Recht: „Infolgedessen wird die Eigenart des christlichen Vorsehungsglaubens an den beiden Merkmalen erkannt, daß das Wirken Gottes als der bestimmende Faktor in dem gegenwärtigen Geschehen sich darstellt und daß als Maßstab dieses gegenwärtigen Wirkens Gottes die Rücksicht auf den individuellen Zustand des einzelnen Lebens betrachtet wird." **Ein solcher Erhaltungs- und Vorsehungsglaube trägt rein religiösen Charakter und ist unmittelbar auf Gott und seine Absichten als die „prima causa" bezogen.**

Die strenge Naturwissenschaft betrachtet dagegen den ganzen Weltbestand und alles einzelne Geschehen in ihm rein vom naturwissenschaftlichen Standpunkt aus. Sie beschreibt mit ihren Mitteln alle Substanzen und Veränderungen einschließlich der menschlichen in ihrer sichtbaren und beobachtbaren Form und führt sie auf

entsprechende natürliche Ursachen zurück. Die menschliche Leiblichkeit erklärt sich aus der physischen Erzeugung und ihre Erhaltung aus dem Maß der vorhandenen Körperkräfte. Ihren Bestand läßt sie durch die Gesetzmäßigkeit des Lebendigen wie die Nahrungsaufnahme bedingt sein. Diese naturwissenschaftliche Betrachtung ist eine so völlig andersartige, daß sie die religiöse überhaupt nicht berührt, sie weder einschließt noch unmöglich macht. Umgekehrt aber kann der religiöse Mensch die naturwissenschaftliche Erfassungsweise in seine Glaubensüberzeugung dadurch aufnehmen, daß er in ihr die Erfassung der „secundae causae" sieht, durch die Gott als „prima causa" wirkt. Ein Paul Gerhardt hat in seinem großen Vorsehungslied: „Befiehl du deine Wege" diesem Gedanken die Form unmittelbarer lebendiger Anschauung gegeben: „Der Wolken, Luft und Winden gibt Wege, Lauf und Bahn, der wird auch Wege finden, da dein Fuß gehen kann." **Gott benutzt die von ihm geschaffene und erhaltene Natur in ihrer eigenen Gesetzlichkeit zum Besten der Menschen.** Die Urteile: Die Medizin hat mir geholfen und Gott hat mich errettet, schließen sich zu dem Urteil zusammen: Gott hat mich durch die Medizin gesund gemacht. Wie im einzelnen Fall, so wird auch im Ganzen und Großen der von der Naturwissenschaft behauptete natürlich kausale Zusammenhang von dem religiösen Menschen auf Gottes erhaltende Kraft zurückgeführt.

Ein Konflikt zwischen diesen beiden Betrachtungsweisen entsteht erst in dem Augenblick, wo entweder die Naturwissenschaft glaubt den Naturzusammenhang atheistisch oder wenigstens antichristlich deuten zu sollen oder die religiöse Betrachtungsweise die Feststellung oder Aufrechterhaltung bestimmter überlieferter Vorstellungsformen von der Art der innerweltlichen Kräfte und ihrer Zusammenhänge behauptet. Im ersteren Fall handelt es sich um eine deutliche Grenzüberschreitung der Naturwissenschaft und eine Verwandlung in Naturphilosophie, deren gänzlich fragwürdige Grunddogmen von der Ewigkeit von Kraft und Stoff schon früher abgeleitet wurden. Im zweiten Fall handelt es sich um ein Mißverständnis der Absicht biblischer Aussagen, die niemals rein naturwissenschaftliche Erkenntnis bringen wollen. Denn alle Mitteilungen der Bibel über den fertigen Naturbestand sind in keinem Fall wissenschaftlicher Selbstzweck, sondern nur Mittel für religiöse Erkenntnis. Jene erfolgen darum naturgemäß im Anschluß an die naive Beobachtung, die zum Beispiel die Sonne auf- und untergehen läßt, oder im Anschluß an das jeweilige antike — Weltbild, dessen Spuren allerdings in der Bibel und besonders bei Jesus viel weniger hervortreten, wie das moderne Meinungen behaupten. **Infolgedessen stehen die biblischen Aussagen weder dem Fortschritt der naturwissenschaftlichen Welterkenntnis im Weg, noch verlieren sie durch ihn ihre religiöse Geltung.** Der letztere Tatbestand läßt sich an ein paar

grundlegenden Beispielen, die mit dem Erhaltungs- und Vorsehungsglauben zusammenhängen, erweisen. Die ungeheure raumzeitliche Ausdehnung des modernen Weltbildes im Unterschied zum antiken schädigt den Glauben an Gott, seine Schöpfung, Erhaltung, Vorsehung nicht nur nicht, sondern steigert mit der Größe der Schöpfung auch die ihres Erhalters und Lenkers auf das Höchste. Der moderne naturwissenschaftliche Nachweis, daß die Erde ihrer Masse nach nicht mehr physisches Zentrum des gesamten Weltalls ist, schließt eine zentrale Stellung auf geistig-religiösem Gebiet nicht aus, da materielle und geistige Bedeutung — wie sich das bei einzelnen Menschen aber auch bei ganzen Erdteilen — beobachten läßt, durchaus nicht identisch sind. Zudem beschränkt das Christentum seine Behauptung auf die positive Tatsache, daß Gott sich in besonderm Maß als Schöpfer wie Erlöser der Erdenmenschen angenommen hat, ohne damit die Möglichkeit einer Gottesbeziehung zu andern Welten ausschließen zu wollen. — Wenn die naturwissenschaftliche Betrachtung die räumliche Lokalisierung Gottes im Himmel und des Bösen in der Hölle ablehnt, so tut sie nur dasselbe, was vom religiösen Standpunkt aus schon im Alten Testament 1. Könige 8, 27 ausspricht: „Denn meinst du auch, daß Gott auf Erden wohne? Siehe der Himmel und alle Himmel mögen dich nicht umfangen," und Psalm 139, 8: „Führe ich gen Himmel, so bist du da. Bettete ich mich in die Hölle, so bist du auch da." Die moderne naturwissenschaftliche Erkenntnis leistet darum der christlichen Religion nur den Dienst, daß sie schärfer den eigentlichen Glaubensgehalt von der auch heute noch unumgänglichen zeiträumlichen Einkleidung der ewigen Wahrheit trennen lehrt. **Gottes Erhaltung umfaßt auch das für unsre Erkenntnis immer gewaltiger gewordene Weltall, Gottes Vorsehung erstreckt sich auch auf die millionenfach vergrößerte Menschheit.** Beides ist dadurch nur größer und wunderbarer geworden.

II. Wunderglaube.

Solange sich der christliche Erhaltungs- und Vorsehungsglaube damit begnügt, Gott sich in den von der Naturwissenschaft beschriebenen Formen und Gesetzen als „prima causa" auswirken zu lassen, bestehen keine wirklichen Konflikte zwischen der religiösen und naturwissenschaftlichen Betrachtungsweise. Anders wird das in dem Augenblick, wo der christliche Glaube das Vorkommen von Ereignissen behauptet, die sich aus natürlich-innerweltlichen Kräften und deren gesetzmäßigen Zusamenhang nicht nur nicht erklären lassen, sondern diesen sogar zu widerstreben und sie zu durchbrechen scheinen. Solche Geschehnisse aber nimmt der christliche Glaube an und zwar positiv in dem Sinn, daß Gott unvermittelt neuschaffend und umgestaltend in die natürliche Welt eingreift. **Der Christ glaubt**

an Wunder in dem strengen Verständnis, daß es Ereignisse gibt, die sich aus dem regelmäßigen Naturverlauf nicht erklären lassen, sondern nur aus einer unmittelbaren Betätigung Gottes. Dieser Glaube ist auf das engste mit der Annahme einer besondern Offenbarungs- und Heilsgeschichte, aber auch mit einem lebendigen Vorsehungsglauben verbunden, wie die christliche Dogmatik des Näheren zu entwickeln hat.

Gegen diesen Wunderglauben aber richtet sich mit größter Energie der Einspruch des modernen Menschen in Anlehnung an die Naturwissenschaft. Schon der französische Philosoph Rousseau hatte erklärt: „Nehmet die Wunder weg und alle Welt wird Christus zu Füßen fallen!" — eine Anschauung, die im 19. Jahrhundert, besonders in materialistisch-monistischen Kreisen die negative Formulierung gewonnen hat: Weil das Christentum den Wunderglauben enthält, lehnen wir es als unverträglich mit der modernen Naturwissenschaft ab.

Von theologischer Seite hat man zum Teil den Versuch gemacht, den Wunderbegriff vom Christentum abzulösen, oder ihn doch so umzudeuten, daß er keinen Anstoß mehr bietet. Harnack hat zum Beispiel in seinem Wesen des Christentums das strenge Wunder abgelehnt und durch die Formel zu ersetzen gesucht, daß es des Wunderbaren und Geheimnisvollen genug gäbe. Allein ein Geheimnis bedeutet nur einen Tatbestand, der zur Zeit oder vielleicht für alle Zukunft sich zwar von uns nicht natürlich erklären läßt, während er aber im Grund doch aus natürlichen Kräften erwachsen ist. Wunder bezeichnet dagegen eine Wirklichkeit, die sich nie und nimmer aus natürlichen Ursachen, sondern positiv nur aus einem unmittelbaren Eingriff Gottes erklären läßt. Die Auferstehung eines toten Menschen ist nicht ein Geheimnis, sondern ein Wunder. Andre Theologen haben sich auf die Unterscheidung von inneren und äußeren Wundern zurückgezogen und zwar im Anschluß an ein Lutherwort, das aber doch nur besagt, daß die inneren Wunder der Wiedergeburt und Bekehrung die Hauptwunder sind, diesen aber gerade den strengsten Wundercharakter wahrt und außerdem die äußeren Wunder keineswegs ablehnt. Man hat sodann versucht, alle Naturwunder in geistige Wunder umzugestalten. Allein auch diese Auskunft beseitigt nicht die Schwierigkeiten, da auch das geistige Geschehen in seinen Kräften und Gesetzen bestimmt und begrenzt ist und zudem in unauflöslichem Zusammenhang mit dem Naturgeschehen steht und gerade christliche Hauptwunder wie die Auferstehung Jesu Wunder im äußeren und inneren Sinn sind. So läßt sich **der Wunderbegriff nur mit dem Wesen des geschichtlichen und lebendigen Christentums selbst aufgeben.** Wer ihn festhält muß darum den Konflikt mit der Naturwissenschaft zunächst in seinem ganzen Ernst anerkennen und empfinden.

Denn auf der andern Seite kann man der strengen Naturwissenschaft, in dem Sinn, wie wir früher ihr Wesen bestimmt haben, von sich aus nicht zumuten, ein Wunder anzuerkennen, ja nicht einmal seine Möglichkeit offen zu lassen. Ein dem Christentum durchaus freundlich gegenüberstehender Naturforscher hat von seinem Standpunkt aus durchaus mit Recht erklärt: „Das Kausalitätsprinzip ist unter allen Umständen das leitende Prinzip der Naturforschung. Wollte sie von ihm einen Tüttel aufgeben, so hieße das, daß sie sich selbst aufgäbe. Es kann für den Naturforscher prinzipiell kein Wunder in dem Sinn geben, daß das Kausalitätsprinzip irgendwie durchbrochen würde." Gewiß kennt auch die moderne Naturwissenschaft den gesamten Kausalzusammenhang nicht lückenlos und bestimmt ihn auch im einzelnen keineswegs immer richtig, aber das hindert sie nicht, im Prinzip auch ihre Lücken durch die Postulierung innerweltlicher Naturkräfte auszufüllen, und wenn sie einmal falsche natürliche Ursachen angenommen hat, dann nach andern gleichartigen Ursachen zu forschen. Dagegen rechnet die Naturwissenschaft niemals — auch hypothetisch nicht — mit „übernatürlichen" Kräften. Die neuerdings in der Naturwissenschaft mehrfach vertretene Auffassung, daß unsre gesamte, besonders auch unsre gesetzliche Auffassung der Natur eine nur von unserm subjektiven Geist geschaffene sei, hilft auch nicht zu einer Verträglichkeit mit dem Wunderglauben. Denn wenn alle unsre Auffassungen von dem Naturgeschehen rein subjektiv wären, so wären es nicht minder diejenigen von den Wundern, und in unserm Geist würden Natur und Wunderglaube ebenso hart und unversöhnlich aufeinander prallen, wie in einer objektiven Welt natürliches und wunderbares Geschehen.

Wunder und Naturwissenschaft können mithin nicht dadurch versöhnt werden, daß man entweder das Wunder oder die Naturwissenschaft solange umdeutet, bis beide ihre spezifischen Merkmale verloren haben. Nur eine über die Naturwissenschaft und den unmittelbaren Glauben hinausgreifende **christliche Philosophie** kann den Versuch machen, die beiden Gebiete miteinander innerlich zu verknüpfen.

Eine solche christliche Philosophie schließt eine Reihe von Grundgedanken in sich, die anerkannt werden müssen, wenn man sich das Verhältnis von Wundern und Naturwissenschaft verständlich machen will. Wunder setzen die Existenz eines weltunterschiedenen und weltmächtigen Gottes voraus, werden dagegen von vornherein unmöglich bei einer atheistischen, pantheistischen, deistischen Gottesvorstellung. Gibt es keinen Gott, so fällt selbstverständlich auch die „prima causa" für das Wunder fort; ist Gott — im Sinn des Pantheismus — mit der Natur identisch, so kann er nicht

schöpferisch und wunderbar in die Welt eingreifen. Hält sich der Schöpfergott später — nach der Meinung des Deismus — von seinem Werk völlig fern, so wird er in ihm nichts Eigentümliches mehr wirken wollen und können. **Nur bei einer theistischen Gottesauffassung ist die Voraussetzung für ein weltunterschiedenes und weltmächtiges, wunderbares Wirken Gottes gegeben.**

Da nun aber nach unsern früheren Ausführungen (Teil I) der gesamte Naturbestand von Gott geschaffen und erhalten wird, scheint ein Eingriff in ihn in der Form des Wunders völlig überflüssig, ja religiös geradezu unerträglich zu sein, weil er den Charakter einer Selbstkorrektur Gottes oder mindestens einer nachträglichen Ausbesserung seines Werkes an sich tragen würde. Gott scheint die Welt so schlecht oder so verbesserungsbedürftig gestaltet zu haben, daß er mit einem Wunder nachhelfen muß. Diese Gedanken würden zutreffen, wenn nicht die zweite Grundvoraussetzung einer christlichen Philosophie in der Annahme bestände, daß die gegenwärtige Welt von sündigen und irrationellen Elementen, die Gott nicht gewollt und darum auch nicht geschaffen und erhalten hat, durchsetzt wäre — eine Annahme, die in der Sündenlehre der Dogmatik näher begründet wurde. Das Wunder hat seinen Grund und Sinn gerade in der Beseitigung und Umformung der sündigen und irrationellen Bestandteile in der Welt durch eine reinigende Wirkung Gottes. **Unter religiösem Gesichtspunkt ist das Wunder eine erlösende Handlung Gottes, unter philosophischem ist es eine Rationalisierung des Irrationellen. Das christliche Wunder ist die Gegenaktion Gottes gegen Sünde und Unvernunft.** Darum hängt es mit Erlösung und Offenbarung auf das engste zusammen. Das Wunder ist die Form, in der Gott seine Erlösung in Geschichte und Einzelleben durchsetzt. Für einen christlichen Philosophen ist es darum nichts Widersinniges, sondern etwas absolut Notwendiges, ja Selbstverständliches.

Bei dieser festen Fundamentierung des Wunders in den Grundgedanken einer christlichen Philosophie, in ihrer Gottes-, Sünden-, Erlösungs- und Offenbarungslehre wird diese aber auch den Versuch machen müssen, die doch auch von Gott gewirkte Natur und ihr Verständnis durch die Naturwissenschaft in ihr gesamtes System aufzunehmen. Man wird dabei von der Beobachtung ausgehen können, daß — noch abgesehen von allen supranaturalen Faktoren — in der Welt zwei völlig verschiedene Kräftereihen vorhanden sind, die materielle und die geistige, letztere besonders in der Form des freien menschlichen Willens. Beide Reihen laufen vielfach parallel ohne jede Berührung im Leben nebeneinander: ein Stein rollt nach seinen Gesetzen; der menschliche Geist strebt seinen Zielen zu. Aber es findet doch auch ein unaufhörliches Ineinander-

greifen statt. Eine Kugel, die nur den Gesetzen ihres Schwergewichtes folgt, trifft auf ein menschliches Gehirn und zerstört mit diesem auch die tiefsten geistigen und schöpferischen Prozesse. Umgekehrt greift menschliche Erfindungskraft ein, benutzt, lenkt ab, ändert den naturgesetzlichen Verlauf eines Flusses, indem es ihm eine ganz andre Bahn gibt, ihn nötigt, von Menschen erfundene Räder zu treiben und ihre Zwecke zu fördern. Könnte ein Fluß sprechen, so würde er in einer solchen Behandlung eine Vergewaltigung und Aenderung seiner Natur finden, dementsprechend wie umgekehrt der menschliche Geist vielfach die Einflüsse der Natur als irrationell und sinnwidrig empfindet. Dennoch aber verbinden sich für eine höhere Betrachtung die beiden Kräftereihen zu einer inneren Einheit; Natur und Geist verknüpfen sich miteinander und erst dadurch entsteht unsre Wirklichkeit, daß eine fortwährende Wechselwirkung zwischen ihnen sich vollzieht, Natur auf Geist, Geist auf Natur wirkt.

In Analogie zu diesen Beobachtungen kann das religiöse Wunder auf eine dritte von den beiden innerweltlichen Kräftereihen qualitativ verschiedene Kategorie einer supranaturalen Kausalität, die unmittelbare schöpferische Lebendigkeit Gottes, zurückgeführt werden. Gott benutzt die vorhandenen Bestände an Geist und Natur genau so, wie der Mensch die Materie durch seinen Willen umformt, gestaltet, sie zu höheren Zielen lenkt, von verderblichen und unvernünftigen Betätigungen reinigt. Die christliche Philosophie macht aus einem Dualismus einen Trialismus der Wirklichkeit, der aber ebensowenig unmöglich und undenkbar ist wie der erstere. Wer die Stufe des Monismus als einer wirklichkeitswidrigen überschritten hat, vermag über die zweite auch zur dritten Stufe aufzusteigen. **Er sieht Natur, Geist und Gott in der Welt neben- und miteinander wirken.**

Die Möglichkeiten einer solchen Verbindung verschiedener Kräftereihen mit besonderen Gesetzen erklärt sich letztlich nur daraus, daß sie aufeinandergestimmt sind. Ist die Natur fähig für die Aufnahme menschlicher Geisteswirkungen, so hat das seinen Grund darin, daß die Natur darauf angelegt ist. Niemals würde unser Geist auf der Klaviatur unsers Gehirnes so vollkommen spielen können, wenn diese nicht für jenen bestimmt wäre. Ein Philosoph wie Leibnitz hat für diese Tatsache den Begriff der „prästabilierten Harmonie" geprägt. Von Anfang an sind schon bei ihrer Schöpfung Natur und Geist für eine Verbindung geschaffen und geformt, so wie man von zwei verschiedenen Menschen sagt, daß schon die Sterne sie zu einer Freundschaft vorausbestimmt haben. Genau ebenso aber steht es mit dem Verhältnis der Wunder Gottes zum Weltgeschehen. Sie greifen nicht nachträglich in eine für sie abgeschlossene Welt

ein, sondern von Anbeginn sind die Stellen und Stunden vorausbestimmt, in denen sie geschehen. Gottes ewiger Ratschluß umfaßt alles: Natur, Geist, Wunder — nicht nur in ihrer Unterschiedenheit, sondern auch in ihrer Verbundenheit. Vor seinem ewigen Auge liegt das Weltgewebe nicht nur mit seinen schwarzen und weißen Fäden, sondern auch mit den goldenen, die in seine Mitte eingewirkt werden. Gerade auch die biblische Offenbarung betont immer wieder, wie die natürliche Geschichte vorausbestimmt war, um die wunderbare Heilsgeschichte aufzunehmen. Lukas verknüpft das Kommen des Erlösers eng mit dem weltlichen Kaisertum des Augustus und Paulus formuliert: „Als die Zeit erfüllet war, sandte Gott seinen Sohn."

Die Verknüpfung von Wunderglaube und Naturwissenschaft vollzieht eine christliche Philosophie durch die Annahme eines Welt und Ueberwelt umspannenden Zusammenhanges, als dessen selbständige aber doch zueinander passende, weil von Ewigkeit aufeinander bestimmte Teile das natürliche und wunderbare Geschehen zu begreifen sind.

III. Einzelne Wunder. Auferstehung Christi.

Mit der Feststellung der prinzipiellen Denkbarkeit und Möglichkeit eines Wunders sind noch längst nicht alle diesen Charakter beanspruchende Ereignisse als solche legitimiert, sondern ist nur ihre vorurteilsfreie Prüfung sichergestellt. Wer das Wunder an sich leugnet, muß voreingenommen jedes Ereignis seines wunderbaren Charakters entkleiden; wer prinzipiell Wunder annimmt, kann dagegen vorurteilsfrei die Ansprüche verschiedener Geschehnisse auf die Eigenschaften eines Wunders ansehen. **Merkmal für ein christliches Wunder im strengen Sinn sind: 1. Die Glaubwürdigkeit der geschichtlichen Ueberlieferung, wenn es sich um ein Geschehnis der Vergangenheit handelt; 2. Seine Unerklärlichkeit aus natürlichen Ursachen; 3. Sein Zusammenhang mit der objektiven und subjektiven Erlösung.**

Ist eine geschichtliche Ueberlieferung nicht glaubwürdig, so gehört ein Ereignis in die Kategorie der absichtslos oder absichtsvoll dichtenden Sage; läßt sich ein Ereignis natürlich erklären, so wird es dadurch noch nicht wertlos, aber es gehört nur in die natürliche Betätigungsform der göttlichen Erhaltung und Vorsehung hinein. Hat ein Ereignis keine Beziehung zu Erlösung und zum Heil des Menschen, so mag es noch so unerklärlich sein, aber ein christliches Wunder ist es nicht.

Wir veranschaulichen die Brauchbarkeit dieser Maßstäbe durch ihre Anwendung auf eines der bedeutsamsten christlichen Wunder: **Die Auferstehung Jesu** — naturgemäß ohne hier das ganze Material auch nur entfernt aufrollen zu können. Wir haben für dieses

Ereignis die verschiedensten Berichte im Neuen Testament, die gerade durch ihre Spannungen im einzelnen beweisen, daß sie auf verschiedene, von einander unabhängige Zeugen zurückgehen, also nicht das Produkt einer stilisierten Legende sind. Gerade die neuere Kritik ist in der Arbeit eines kritisch gerichteten Theologen Fr. Spitta: „Die Auferstehung Jesu," 1918, zu dem Resultat gekommen: „Wir stehen hier auf festem Boden und wenn auch die oft gehörte Behauptung, die Auferstehung Jesu sei das sicherst bezeugte Ereignis der Vergangenheit etwas hochgegriffen ist, so kann sie sich doch sehr wohl mit irgendeinem andern evangelischen Ereignis messen, an dessen Geschichtlichkeit zu zweifeln eine vernünftige Kritik nicht denkt." Geschichtlich vollkommen einwandfrei sind danach zwei Tatbestände: das leere Grab und die Erscheinung des Auferstandenen. Wer sie beseitigen will, muß sie natürlich erklären. Für das leere Grab gibt es heute aber keine ernst zu nehmende rationale Erklärung, weder den Scheintod noch den Diebstahl des Leichnams Jesu durch seine Jünger oder Feinde. Beide Hypothesen verwirren sich in die größten Unmöglichkeiten. Umso leichter glaubt man heute die Erscheinung Jesu aus Visionen der Jünger erklären zu können. Aber gerade nach unsrer heutigen Kenntnis müssen ganz bestimmte Voraussetzungen für das Entstehen von Visionen gegeben sein. Im Geist des Visionärs müssen schon die Gedanken und Bilder leben, die er dann in Gesichten als scheinbaren Gebilden der Außenwelt objektiviert. Die Jünger müßten daher schon an die Auferstehung Jesu geglaubt haben, wenn sie in Visionen den Auferstandenen schauten. Mit Recht aber stellt Spitta fest: „Die Jünger haben tatsächlich die Erscheinung des Auferstandenen als die Offenbarung eines ganz unerwarteten Wunders empfunden, gegen dessen Wirklichkeit sich ihr ganzes Mißtrauen und hartnäckiger Zweifel kehrte." Schlatter in seinem Buch: „Die Geschichte des Christentums," 1920, vertieft den Gegensatz des neutestamentlichen Glaubens und den aus einer Vision entstanden ins Prinzipielle: „Der Unterschied zwischen einem Glauben, der durch Vision entsteht und dem, den die Jünger vertreten, ist so tief, daß der eine nicht aus dem andern entstehen konnte. Mit dem Wesen der Vision ist immer das Bewußtsein verbunden, sie stehe aus eigenem psychischen Zustand vor ihm. Hierin aber hat gerade der neutestamentliche Glaube nicht seinen Grund."

Mag man aber auch noch das Auftreten einer einzelnen Auferstehungsvision für möglich halten, so würde das wiederholte Auftreten solcher Visionen der Wirklichkeit eine allgemein verbreitete krankhafte Anlage und eine dauernde psychische Erregbarkeit voraussetzen, für deren Vorhandensein bei den gesunden und nüchternen Jüngern Jesu kein Anlaß war. Auch der Versuch, den einzig wissen-

schaftlichen Begriff der subjektiven Vision in den einer „objektiven Vision" umzugestalten, in dem Sinn, daß Gott durch seinen Geist, aber doch durch ein Medium der sinnenfälligen Welt auf die Jünger Jesu so wirkte, daß sie den Auferstandenen tatsächlich zu sehen glaubten, bringt keine wirkliche Erklärung. Denn das Wunder wird nur größer und unbegreiflicher und das leere Grab ist niemals durch eine objektive Vision zu erklären. Selbst wenn man religionsgeschichtliche Erklärungen zu Hilfe nimmt, gelingt es nicht, die Auferstehung ihres wunderbaren Charakters zu berauben. Daß sie im engsten Zusammenhang mit der Heilsgeschichte steht, ja ihre Krönung bedeutet und darum auch für das persönliche christliche Leben von höchster Bedeutung ist, bedarf an dieser Stelle keiner weiteren Ausführung. **So führt die Anwendung der allgemeinen Maßstäbe für die Anerkennung eines Wunders auf die Auferstehung Christi zu der sicheren Erkenntnis, daß sie ein Wunder im strengen Sinn ist.**

Die Parusie Jesu Christi — Die Hoffnung der Christen.

Pastor Ed. Schweizer.

I. Ihre Bedeutung.

Nicht bloß sein unsichtbares Kommen zu den Seinen im Geist, sondern seine aller Welt sichtbare Erscheinung hat der Herr vorausgesagt. Seine Wiederkunft war darum die Hoffnung der gläubigen Christen von der Zeit der Apostel an bis auf den heutigen Tag. Die Parusie des Herrn ist von großer Bedeutung, man kann sagen eine **Notwendigkeit** in verschiedener Hinsicht.

1. **Zur Ehrenrettung Jesu Christi.** Seine Auferstehung war seine Rechtfertigung im Kreis seiner Freunde. Sie hat den schmählich verleumdeten und als Uebeltäter gekreuzigten Herrn als den Gerechten, als den Messias und Sohn Gottes erwiesen und auf sein Leben und Leiden das Siegel Gottes geprägt. Dem Herrn Jesus gebührt eine abermalige und herrlichere Ehrenrettung und das vor aller Welt, und die unbestechliche Gerechtigkeit Gottes bürgt dafür. Sie ist allmächtig und wird dafür sorgen, daß im Namen Jesu sich alle beugen und bekennen müssen, daß Jesus Christus der Herr sei zur Ehre Gottes des Vaters, zum Ruhm seiner Gerechtigkeit, die nicht gestatten kann, daß Jesus, dem Gott die Rettung der Welt aus des Feindes Gewalt verdankt, für immer verkannt, verachtet, gehaßt und verschmäht werde, wie es jetzt geschieht. Die Erscheinung des Herrn wird seine abermalige Ehrenrettung sein, denn sie geschieht mit einer so gewaltigen Manifestation seiner Macht und Herrlichkeit, daß die ihm in den Drangsalen durch den Antichristen Treugebliebenen ihre Häupter aufheben und frohlocken, darum daß ihre Erlösung naht. Die ungläubigen und feindseligen Weltvölker werden sich entsetzen und heulen vor Furcht und Schrecken, denn mit ihrer Macht und Freiheit ist es vorbei: Sie sind gerichtet. Das Gericht über den Unglauben und die Rechtfertigung des Glaubens an den Herrn der Herrlichkeit ist also **die erste Wirkung** der Parusie Jesu Christi. Weitere Folgen sind:

2. **Das Gericht über den Satan, den Fürsten dieser Welt.** Durch Vernichtung des Unglaubens verliert er sein Recht und damit seine Macht. Durch Verführung zum Unglauben ist er zum Fürsten der Welt geworden. Denn in den Kindern Adams hat sich der Unglaube fortgesetzt, das Dichten und Trachten des sündigen von Gottes Geist verlassenen Menschen ging mehr oder weniger aus dem Unglauben und verweltlichte. Auch die besten, die ihr Gewissen respektierten und dem Zug ihres Herzens zu Gott hin zu folgen suchten, waren zu schwach sich dem Einfluß der finsteren Macht

zu erwehren und gerieten in den Bann des Aberglaubens und des Unglaubens. Wird nun beim Kommen des Herrn in seiner göttlichen Majestät alle Welt zum Glauben genötigt, so ist der Satan fertig und kann weggenommen und gefangen gelegt werden, bis Gott seiner noch einmal bedarf. Offb. 20, 1—3.

3. **Das Gericht über den Antichristen und den falschen Propheten.** Offb. 19. 20. Sie werden nicht bloß weggenommen und unschädlich gemacht, sondern lebendig in den feurigen Pfuhl geworfen. Zur Erklärung: Das Antichristentum ist der bewußte Unglaube und die Feindschaft gegen Christum. Es ist eine Stiftung Satans, des Hauptfeindes Christi. Wie er von Anfang der Antideus gewesen, so ist er der Antichrist von Anfang an. Kaiphas, der Hohe Rat, Judas, die Pharisäer usw. waren seine Werkzeuge. Im Ebionitismus, im Gnostizismus und manch andern Häresien war auch Antichristentum. Die römischen Imperatoren verliehen dem Antichristentum Gewalt und es kam zu grimmigen Verfolgungen. Dasselbe geschah auch durch die römische Inquisition. Gegenwärtig hat die Christusfeindschaft in Rußland Gewalt und die Bekenner Christi sind in Lebensgefahr. In den Ostsee-Provinzen sind viel Märtyrer geworden. Wo der Feind nicht mit Gewalt das Christentum ausrotten kann, sucht er es zu fälschen. Er sät Unkraut in den Weizen und es entstehen Irrlehren, und die Leute lassen sich verführen. Je frecher ein Verführer auftritt, um so sicherer hat er Erfolg, denn das Volk hat Respekt vor der Ueberzeugung, auch wenn sie falsch ist. So alt das Antichristentum, so alt auch die falsche Prophetie. Ich verstehe darunter die negative Wissenschaft, welche dem Unglauben die Gründe liefert. Insbesondre die Bibelkritik, welche die Offenbarung Gottes durch die Propheten und seinen Sohn in Frage stellt; welche die Wunder, die Gottessohnschaft Jesu im Sinn des Johannes und Paulus bestreitet und die Glaubwürdigkeit der apostolischen Schrift anficht — „Denn wenn das Wort nicht mehr soll gelten, worauf soll der Glaube ruhn." Darum ist nach der Apokalypse der falsche Prophet der Assistent des Antichristen und werden miteinander abgetan beim Kommen des Herrn. Beide werden als Persönlichkeiten betrachtet. Der Antichrist auch von Johannes in seiner Epistel, Kap. 4, 3, bestimmter noch von Paulus, 2. Thess. 2, 3—10, das paßt auf den Russen Lenin, den sie göttlich verehren. Lenin aber war nur ein **Vorläufer** des Antichristen. Der persönliche Antichrist ist noch zukünftig. Die Geschichte lehrt, daß Ideen und geistige Richtungen erst in kraftvollen Personen ihre durchschagende Macht gewinnen. Das Bedürfnis einer Reformation der Kirche war klar erkannt und tiefgefühlt. Es wurden auf Konzilien auch viele Versuche zu einer Verbesserung gemacht; aber es wäre nichts aus einer Reformation

geworden ohne Luther, Zwingli und Kalvin. Die französische Revolution wäre resultatlos im Sand verlaufen, hätte nicht Napoleon die Prinzipien der Revolution in seinem Kodex Napoleon gerettet. Anno 1849 arbeitete ein Parlament in der Pauls-Kirche zu Frankfurt an der Einigung der deutschen Stämme. Prof. T. Beck rief ihnen zu: „Es wird euch nicht gelingen, es fehlt euch der rechte Mann." Als der kam, wurde Deutschland einig. Dem Satan darf es gelingen in den zwei Personen den ganzen Christushaß kulminieren und sich konzentrieren zu lassen — wahre Satansmenschen, wie es bis dahin keine gegeben hat. Da werden auch die Auserwählten der satanischen Dialektik und Sophistik gegenüber einen schweren Stand haben. Ist es jetzt schon bei minder gefährlichen Versuchungen und bei kräftiger Unterstützung durch Gläubige manchen Leuten schwer Glauben zu halten. Es wird aber der letzte Anlauf des Feindes, Christum fern zu halten, sein. Seine Mittel sind erschöpft, er kann weggenommen werden, und Jesus Christus tritt die Weltherrschaft an.

Anmerkung: Es gibt eine Theologie, die von einem ganz andern Verlauf der Geschichte spricht, wobei Christi Parusie gar nicht notwendig ist; man wird ohne ihn fertig. Da sagt mir einer: „Die Welt wird imer gebilderter, gesitterter und frömmer. Allmählich verschwindet das Böse und das Gute nimmt überhand und endlich ist das Reich Gottes da." Prohibition, Demokratie und Kriegsächtung sind Hauptmittel zur Aufrichtung des Reiches Christi. Das ist ein bodenloser Optimismus. Und Leute, die ihrem Guten so viel zutrauen, kennen offenbar die Macht des Bösen in der Welt nicht. Sie müssen nicht wissen, daß die Welt im Argen liegt, in des Teufels Gewalt. Aber die Macht der Finsternis nehmen sie gar nicht in Rechnung, sonst meinten sie nicht mit so leichten Mitteln mit dem Bösen fertig zu werden. Das Böse ist nicht nur Mangel an Kultur, daß es mit guten Schulen und Bildung abgetan werden könnte. Es ist merkwürdig, daß der alte, von Augustin und von den Reformatoren so eifrig bekämpfte, Pelagianismus wieder auflebt in evangelischen Kirchen. Mit dem Fürsten dieser Welt liegt Jesus im Kampf, und erst nach seiner Vertreibung kann Jesus seine Herrschaft antreten. Mit Recht hat Luther gesagt: „Groß' Macht und viel List, Sein grausam Rüstung ist, Auf Erd'n ist nicht sein's gleichen." Wohl hat auch Luther gesagt: „Kein Wörtlein kann ihn fällen." Aber es müssen doch Helden des Glaubens sein, die mit einem Wörtlein den Feind fällen und sich ihn vom Leib halten können. Jesus nennt den Feind einen starken Gewappneten, der seinen Palast bewahret, seine Festung in der Welt behauptet, bis ein Stärkerer über ihn kommt, der ihm seinen Harnisch auszieht. Jesus ist der Stärkere, und in seiner Parusie kommt er über

den Feind. Jesu muß er weichen, vor Jesu hat er Respekt. Denn an ihm ist er in allen Versuchungen zu Schanden geworden. Es gelang ihm nicht, Jesum von Gott zu scheiden. Vor Menschen des Glaubens, den Bundesgenossen Gottes und Jesu Christi, hat der Satan ebenfalls Respekt, nicht aber vor menschlicher Frömmigkeit, Bildung usw. **Die Parusie Jesu Christi ist die einzige Bürgschaft der Christusherrschaft auf Erden, des Sieges der Gerechtigkeit und des Friedens.** Darum sei daraufhin unser Sehnen gerichtet.

II. Das Reich Christi auf Erden.

1. **Verwirklichung kirchlicher und nationaler Bedürfnisse.** Im Gleichnis vom guten Hirten redet Jesus davon, daß alle, die seine Stimme hören, eine Herde unter **einem** Hirten werden sollen. Auch in seinem Gebet Joh. 17 bat er für seine Gläubigen, „daß sie alle eins seien, gleich wie du, Vater, in mir und ich in dir." Dieses Einssein der Gläubigen ist eine heilige **Notwendigkeit.** Fromme Christen sehen das ein und versuchen die getrennten Glaubensgemeinschaften einander näher zu bringen. Das ist mit löblichem Ernst zu Stockholm und Lausanne, auch zu Jerusalem geschehen. Es wird ein Pium Desiderium bleiben. Rom macht zur Bedingung die Unterwerfung unter den Papst, und manche Sekten wollen lieber bleiben, was sie sind, weil sie sich für die allein wahren Kirchen halten. Zur Einigung der Völker ist der famose Völkerbund eingerichtet, der Kriegsächtungspakt ersonnen und unterzeichnet. Alles umsonst. Trotz allen Abrüstungskonferenzen wird mit aller Macht weitergerüstet, die Kriegsursachen bleiben und es gibt immer neue. Es kann keinen Frieden geben, solange die Völker einander beleidigen und Unrecht tun und solange das alte, zum Beispiel an Deutschland, Oesterreich und Ungarn verübte Unrecht, nicht gesühnt ist. Daß diese greulichen Ungerechtigkeiten ihre Sühne bekommen, dafür bürgt die Gerechtigkeit Gottes. Eine absolut sichere Bürgschaft. „Denn Gerechtigkeit ist des göttlichen Thrones Festung und Fundament. Nichts steht so fest als Gottes richtende Gerechtigkeit und ist in der Tat in der Weltgeschichte ein fortlaufendes Weltgericht. „Irret euch nicht" — macht euch keine falschen Vorstellungen — „Gott läßt seiner nicht spotten, was der Mensch sät, wird er ernten." Das eben ist Gerechtigkeit. Jetzt aber kommt die Gerechtigkeit Gottes kaum in Betracht, auch in christlichen Kreisen. „Gott ist Liebe und kann nichts übel nehmen," sagt man. In Christi Reich kommt es gleich zu einer großen Revolution von oben herab. Die Differenzen in Kirche und Staat müssen verschwinden. Alles kirchliche und nationale „Tun" und jeder „Ismus" muß aufhören. Es wird viel, ja sehr viel Zeit nehmen und Widerstand setzen, aber was geschehen muß, wird geschehen: Christus ist König und sein Wille geschieht. Er heißt „Friedefürst," weil er Gerechtig-

keit zur Geltung bringt. Ohne Gerechtigkeit kein Friede. Das ist die **neue Weltordnung** anstelle der alten, die wohl niemand die „gute, alte Zeit" nennen wird.

Anmerkung: Die nationalen Differenzen und die Sprachunterschiede werden mit der Zeit verschwinden, aber die Rassen bleiben. Eine Autorität hat gesagt: „Die Rasseneigenart hat göttliche Berechtigung. Die Rasse ist eine von Gott geschenkte Differenzierung des einheitlichen Menschengeschlechts." Dr. Oehler. Dazu bemerke ich: „Ursprünglich war die Rasse keine Gottesordnung. Nach der Sindflut gab es eine neue Naturordnung: die Klimata entstanden und damit kam es zu Rassen und die bleiben bis ans Ende der jetzigen Naturordnung. Die Schwarzen werden nicht weiß und die Weißen nicht schwarz! Die Verklärung macht sie alle gleich — „Sie werden leuchten wie der Sonne Glanz."

2. **Die Sammlung der Auserwählten** ist eine der ersten Handlungen des neuen Weltfürsten. Dabei kommt es zu Gerichten, zu Erhöhungen und zu Erniedrigungen und betrübten Scheidungen. Von zweien, die auf einer Mühle hantieren, auf einem Bett liegen, oder miteinander auf dem Feld arbeiten, wird je einer, von zehn Jungfrauen werden fünf mitgenommen durch Verwandlung zu den Auserwählten in der Höhe, die Zurückbleibenden bekommen noch eine Frist zur Bekehrung. Verworfen für immer sind sie nicht. Schlimmer geht es dem Schalk und unnützen Knecht. Matth. 25, 14 ff. Er wird in die äußerste Finsternis hinausgeworfen, wo Heulen vor Weh und Zähneknirschen vor Grimm. Furchtbare Strafe der Untreue, von Rechts wegen. Die treuen Knechte und Mägde werden herrlich belohnt: sie gehen ein zu ihres Herrn Freude, auch von Rechts wegen. Es waltet Gerechtigkeit im Strafen und Belohnen. Am schlimmsten geht es dem gewalttätigen Knecht. Matth. 24, 48—54. Der Herr wird ihn zerscheitern und ihm seinen Lohn geben mit den Heuchlern.

3. **Hand in Hand mit der Sammlung und Verklärung der Auserwählten geht die selig und heilig gepriesene erste Auferstehung.** Dieses hohen Vorzugs werden gewürdigt, die dem Herrn angehört haben und in ihm entschlafen sind. Sie werden zusammen mit den verklärten Lebendigen dem Herrn entgegengerückt, nicht in den Himmel, sondern in die Luft, in das von den bösen Geistern gereinigte Tellurium. Aber bei dem Herrn werden sie sein alle Zeit. Diese trostreiche, aber wenig beachtete Hoffnung ist sehr gut bezeugt — 1. Kor. 15, 23; 51—54; 1. Thess. 4, 13—18; Offb. 20, 4—6.

4. **Die Zustände** im tausendjährigen Reich sind erst keineswegs normal. Die Völkerschaften, durch die gewaltigen Zeichen beim Kommen des Herrn gläubig geworden, müssen unter scharfe

Zucht (Offb. 2, 27: „Er wird sie weiden mit eiserner Rute.") Sie müssen sich jetzt bekehren und sich an die neue Weltordnung gewöhnen. Es mag viel Zeit nehmen, bis die kirchlichen Unterschiede erloschen sind und es keine Katholiken und keine Protestanten mehr gibt, sondern nur Christen. So auch, bis es keine Amerikaner, Britten, Russen usw., sondern nur Menschen gibt. — Das Sündigen und Sterben dauert auch noch fort. Doch hat die Sünde ihren Reiz verloren und verspricht nicht mehr Macht, Ehre und Genuß; denn der Einfluß Satans hat aufgehört.

5. **Die Regierung** im tausendjährigen Reich ist keine Demokratie, diese Regierungsform ist Produkt der Revolution und nicht ursprünglich göttliche Ordnung. Ein „notwendiges Uebel," wie man sagt. Das tausendjährige Reich ist eine absolute Monarchie: „Jesus Christus herrscht als König." Eine bessere Regierung könnte es nicht geben. Da hat das Recht die Macht und ein Unrecht darf nicht geschehen. Christi Reich ist der **vollkommene Rechtsstaat.** Ratgeber braucht er nicht, aber Assistenten, Mitregenten. Er nimmt sie aus der Zahl der Auferstandenen — Offb. 20, 6; verwendet wohl auch die Tüchtigsten der Lebenden, Männer und Frauen, zum Dienst an den **Gemeinden,** die auch noch notwendig sein werden, denn die Menschen bedürfen der Belehrung, der Seelsorge und geistlichen Pflege. Da sind Pastoren, Lehrer und auch Schulen notwendig, solange eine Jugend heranwächst. Das alles ist nur in kleinen Abteilungen möglich. Darum wird die Erde in Distrikte eingeteilt sein, jeder mit einem Vorsteher (Präses). Da setzt der König den einen über zehn, den andern über fünf Städte, jeden nach Verdienst und Fähigkeit. So gibt es denn auch im Reich Christi Ehrenstellungen — es gibt Erste und Letzte. Aber von Nepotismus und einer Günstlingswirtschaft kann die Rede nicht sein: Es waltet Gerechtigkeit und alle sind zufrieden. — Auf der unverklärten Erde können Verklärte nicht wohnen. Sie können auf der Erde Besuche machen und nach dem Rechten sehen, wo es nötig ist, wie der Herr selbst getan nach seiner Auferstehung bis zum Eingang in die Herrlichkeit.

6. **Die Aufhebung des auf die Erde gelegten Fluches.** Um des Ungehorsams willen im Unglauben wurde die Erde mit dem Fluch belegt. Sobald der Gehorsam im Glauben hergestellt sein wird, kann der Fluch aufgehoben werden und die Strafen hören auf. Denn Strafe war der Fluch. Die Verwilderung der Natur muß aufhören, die Dornen und Disteln müssen verschwinden, desgleichen alle gefährlichen, schädlichen, häßlichen und lästigen Lebewesen; das wüste und giftige Zeug rechnet der Herr ausdrücklich zu der Macht des Feindes. Lukas 10, 9. Die Naturkatastrophen gehören auch zum Fluch und sind Strafgerichte. Im Reich Christi

gibt es keine verheerenden Stürme und keine Ueberschwemmungen, keine Trockenheiten und Erdbeben mehr. Davon reden auch die Propheten, so Jes. 11. — Weil auch alle Giftstoffe getilgt sind, gibt es keine Seuchen, keine Epidemien und kein frühes Sterben mehr, und die Menschen können ein höheres Alter erreichen. Darum heißt es Jes. 65, 28: „Die Sünder von hundert Jahren werden verflucht sein." Das heißt, wenn einer hundertjährig stirbt, wird man vermuten, er müsse sich schwer versündigt haben. Im gesunden Leib pflegt auch eine gesunde Seele zu wohnen und alle Fähigkeiten kommen zur ungehemmten Entfaltung. Alle Künste und Wissenschaften erreichen ihre höchste Blüte. Es wird daher Christi Reich nicht nur der vollkommene Rechtstaat, sondern auch der **ideale Kulturstaat sein.** Die vom Fluch befreite Erde wird eine unerhörte Fruchtbarkeit entwickeln und Fehlernten gibt es nicht mehr. Es wird niemand mehr Hunger leiden müssen, zumal der ideale Kommunismus das Reichwerden der einen und die Verarmung andrer unmöglich macht. Da wird offenbar, was Gott bei der Erschaffung der Welt und der Menschen im Sinn gehabt hat. Gottes Ideen werden alle zu Realitäten und kein Rat Gottes bleibt unerfüllt — „Du großer und starker Gott! Groß von Rat und mächtig von Tat, Herr Zebaoth ist dein Name." Jer. 32, 18. 19. Eine dürftige Philosophie setzt dem Allmächtigen solche Schranken, daß er weder in der Geschichte der Welt noch in der Natur eingreifen könnte; und eine engherzige Theologie hat so schwache Begriffe von Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Erbarmen, daß sie ungezählte Millionen von Menschen — die Heiden — rettungslos zur Hölle fahren läßt.

III. **Der letzte Kampf.** — Offb. 20, 7—10.

Es wird niemand gekrönt, er habe denn siegreich gekämpft. Auch den in den 1000 Jahren gläubig Gewordenen kann die Probe nicht erlassen werden. In den 1000 Jahren gibt es keine satanischen Versuchungen: Der Versucher ist gefangen gelegt. Jetzt, am Ende dieses Zeitraums wird er in Freiheit gesetzt und auf die Menschen losgelassen. Sein Erfolg ist groß, der Abfall ist nicht gering — Gog und Magog heißt die verführte Menge. Sie umringen das Heerlager der Treugebliebenen und wollen sie vernichten. Doch Feuer vom Himmel vernichtet die Feinde. Nun wird Satan in den Feuerpfuhl versetzt: er hat sein Spiel verloren und Jesus bleibt Sieger. Dem Feind geschieht kein Unrecht. Das wird er selber zugeben müssen. Viele lassen ihn wieder herauskommen und selig werden. Er müßte Buße tun. In der Schrift hat die Apokatastasis keinen gewissen Grund. — Gleich nach dem letzten Angriff der Macht der Finsternis und ihrer Abwehr sah Johannes den weißen Thron, die Auferstandenen und das Endgericht. Der

letzte Feind — der Tod — ist aufgehoben durch die Auferstehung Christi Werk ist vollendet und übergibt sein Reich dem Vater und ist dem, der ihm alles zu Füßen gelegt, selber auch untertan und **Gott ist alles in allem.** Die Weltgeschichte ist zu Ende — Gott hat sein Ziel erreicht, auf einem Umweg, aber dem Sohne hat der Vater das Gelingen zu verdanken. Und wir verdanken ihm unsre Wiederbringung zu Gott. Es hat niemand die Liebe und die Herrlichkeit Gottes verdient wie Jesus und keinem sind wir so viel schuldig wie ihm. Wir stimmen mit Seligen ein: „Das Lamm, das erwürget ist, und hat uns Gott erkauft mit seinem Blut, ist würdig zu nehmen Kraft und Reichtum, Ehre, Preis und Lob."

EDITORIALS

CONFERENCE ON THE WORLD MISSION OF CHRISTIANITY

(Cleveland, December 5-9, 1928)

In our city of Cleveland we have not, at the present time, preachers with a national reputation. In fact we have not had them for quite a number of years. But we have laymen here who make up for the deficiency of the ministers. It would be hard to find anywhere a better Christian man than our F. W. Ramsey. He is still a young man but he is already known all over the country. Last year this was evidenced by his election as the president of the National Council of Y. M. C. A, to succeed Mr. John R. Mott, who had held that position for a great many years. Locally, he is the friend and active supporter of all charitable and religious causes. He invites the Protestant ministers to his country home for their annual "retreat." He is the chairman of the "Community Chest." He is the moving spirit in the Cleveland Church Federation.

In this last capacity he conceived the idea of inviting the missionary and other religious leaders of the country to this city for a conference on the World Mission of Christianity. The missionary zeal had been fanned in him to a bright flame by the World Missionary Convention held at Jerusalem, of which he was a delegate. This conference met here Dec. 5-9, and while it lasted it certainly was a generator of religious interest. More than that, it left impressions that will not be soon effaced. One cannot expect superlative effects from such efforts, but Ramsey deserved the thanks of the churches for bringing here men who furnished fuel and fire for their spiritual life.

Charles Gilkey, of Chicago, was the first speaker on the program. Since he went to India, several years ago, to deliver the Barrows lectures to college audiences, he has come to be in demand in many states. When we saw him sitting on the platform waiting his turn, he reminded us much of what was said of the great apostle, that "his bodily presence was weak." If he did not for all look like a dried-up, round-shouldered, little Jew our powers of observation are faulty. He seemed to be in poor health, besides. Nevertheless he delivered himself of an address that was an intellectual masterpiece. He compared the Christian religion to an aeroplane, that by the rules of physics ought to be inert, being heavier than air, but by the rules of dynamics rises to dizzy heights, owing to its

motor and its energy-creating qualities. This underlying simile of the plane the speaker, with wonderful skill, carried through his whole speech so that from the viewpoint of logical consistency his contribution was truly marvelous. He never fails to refer to his Indian experiences, generally bringing out the fact that the Hindus care nothing for our civilization or even our organized church, but that they will listen for hours if the speaker preaches Jesus, and him only.

Luther Allan Weigle, the Dean of the Yale School of Religion (if we mistake not), was also on the staff. He said some good things and we would not belittle his merits for the world. But in that company he could not quite do himself justice.

Most of us were looking too much for *Stanley Jones* to care very much for any lesser (or older) lights. Dr. Jones, after writing his book on "the Christ of the Indian Road," found himself famous. Every one wanted to see the man who had had such wonderful spiritual experiences and could write of them so fascinatingly. Then came his second production, "Christ at the Round Table," and people saw that he was not only a spiritual man but also endowed with high intellectual gifts. His furlough brought him to America. The Methodist General Conference liked him so well that they wanted to make him a bishop. Stanley Jones, however, preferred to be a missionary. Since then the promoters of all great missionary conventions are ambitious to have him.

He is a man of about 45, polished in his bearing but modest and natural. He is not an emotional speaker, though one would expect that. His native intellect is sharpened by many a clash with highcultured men of other faiths. Still he is not a cold reasoner either; the fire in him may be of a quiet flame but it is steady. He has the gift of ready expression and faultless statement. All in all, you listen to him for a long time without wearying. Although not emotional, he is very devout, and after he is through he draws his audience into a long period of silent prayer, which is only occasionally broken by a few spoken words from him. At one time an old man, Mr. Biddle, well known in church circles here, sang a song after such a silent pause: "Show it by your life and action That you have been with Jesus."

We thought it was deeply impressive, almost unforgettable. Twice Mr. Jones had a discussion in a separate session with the ministers only, where he asked questions and answered others. Some liked his way here very much. He certainly showed the alertness of his mind and his urbane manners. To us these sessions were less satisfactory.

There was some criticism as to the character of his addresses.

Some found them too practical, he just told stories. The stories were good and often striking. But from such a man something more was expected. We granted there was some justification in this complaint. The man and his message had so impressed us though that we had not been conscious of any deficiency. Of the other speakers we will only mention *Robert Speer,* for 40 years a worker in the mission field, either at home or abroad. We take it that every one knows him or of him. He must be nearly 70 now. He still has that ruddy color of his; is still as straight as he ever was; it is still true that he never cracks a smile while speaking. But he still impresses you also with his large information, his knowledge of the mission fields in different continents, and his adequate illustrations with which he bears out every claim he makes for Christianity. Over against too great a tolerance of some Christian admirers of heathen leaders, he holds fast to the uniqueness and absoluteness of Christ. Christ "borrows from no one," he declares.

The Conference did not quite live up to its great title, the "World Mission" of Christianity. It confined itself too much to foreign missions. Had Bishop McConnell who was also on the program been able to come he would probably have given it more balance. But he was being inducted into his new office of chairman of the Federal Council; so the "social gospel" had no adequate representation. In spite of this the present writer was deeply grateful for what was offered. Experiences like this make one appreciative of the privilege of living in this city of ours, and one wishes at such a time that fate (or providence) may keep us here a little while longer.

"DESTROY IT NOT, FOR A BLESSING IS IN IT"

(Isaiah 66, 8)

The Reformers have often been called destroyers by the upholders of the old system. Either their motives have been impugned as though their activities had been merely actuated by the desire to get rid of moral restraints. Or their methods are said to have been wrong. They acted with rashness and undue haste. Instead of trying to bring about a reform of the old institution, they broke the old vessel, and much of the precious water was spilled. History shows that these charges are unjust. Luther certainly was as conservative in clinging to the old as he possibly could. Even to many on his own side he seemed to be too slow and lacking in thoroughness in his breaking away from the old. The Iconoclasts, in his absence, broke the pictures and colored windows in the church as relics of Catholic idolatry. There is no telling what might have been

the result if his return had not called a halt to such insane fanaticism. Luther believed more in evolution than revolution. He had a respect for the developments of history. The new wine might require new bottles, but it was not necessary to destroy everything that had once been used wrongly. "Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it." Those later born were grateful to him that he saved the church from a relapse into barbarism; that he continued to use art as the handmaid of religion in liturgy and church architecture and ornament. The Puritans of the next century went to the extreme limits on the other side. They ushered in a period of hostility to the cultivation of beauty from which it took us centuries to recover. And by their lack of moderation and good taste they contributed perhaps to the process that checked Protestantism in the Established Church and made it a fertile soil for later Catholic movements.

These historical reminiscences were prompted in us by certain observations we make in our own time and church. Luther's wise preservation of historic customs and institutions we miss as we look around. He believed that such things were of value even if sometimes their origin and meaning were forgotten. One should not destroy them for there might be more in them than one dreamed. This attitude ought to be cherished amongst us towards the few good customs we find in our churches. Some are only too ready to drop everything we have in this time, and ape the American churches. If they—the American churches—make the announcements and raise the collection before the sermon, then we must do the same. If they sit down during prayer and rise up for singing, then we must do it although our custom is the very opposite of theirs. Some of our younger brethren are so determined to "Americanize" their people in this respect, that they use almost physical force to bring them to their feet, regardless of the decided unwillingness of the people to change their comfortable position. It makes us hot when we see it, for we would ourselves rather sit still than stand up.

It is well known that the church gown has been discarded by many of our pastors. The choirs put on gowns and move into their places in solemn procession; the minister alone insists on being "unfrocked."

We should keep and foster good customs wherever we find them. They are of slow growth, the product of centuries—and we should not despise them. In some churches the confirmation class sits in the front benches: be glad if you can keep them there. The families of the bereaved come to church the Sunday after the funeral; be grateful that they come then at least, if at no other time, and use your opportunity. A man after his golden wedding, at which

we had officiated, was in church with his wife the Sunday following. We forgot to make mention of it—he never darkened our threshold after that!

The Church Year is a great institution. We don't know whether there is a man amongst us sacrilegious enough or dense enough to pay little heed to it. It is an asset to our church that will pay the largest dividends in the future as it has in the past: make the most of it; even Ascension Day can be made to yield interest if linked up with the Mission cause and being put in charge of some organization.

On the whole, there are not many good customs that can withstand the modern trend towards uniformity. The American churches are consolidating and this process will crowd out many distinctive features that have proved of value in the churches that produced them. Our own Synod is least qualified for a strict adherence to the traditions of the past. We have not the rigidity characteristic of churches with strongly anchored doctrinal or liturgical standards.

It behooves us all the more to make the most of those peculiar features that still have the capacity to survive.

„Es hat dem Allmächtigen gefallen . . ."

Der Einfluß der modernen Wissenschaft ist besonders in dem Artikel von der Vorsehung Gottes zu spüren. Wir sind weniger als unsre Väter geneigt, die Hand Gottes in allen einzelnen Vorgängen unsers Lebens zu sehen, guten und bösen. Am wenigsten noch in den bösen. Verheerende Feuer, Ueberschwemmungen, Erdbeben, Epidemien sehen wir nicht mehr als Schickungen göttlicher Straftätigkeit, als direkte Aeußerungen von Gottes Weltregierung an, obwohl sie uns als Mittel zur Besserung dienen mögen. Wir sehen zunächst auf die natürlichen Mittelursachen, die solche Kalamitäten heraufbringen. Vor einigen Jahren wurde Schreiber dieses ersucht, bei der Beerdigung eines ganz jungen Kindes seines Amtes zu walten. Das Kind war an Diphtheritis gestorben. Der Vater, ein intelligenter Mann, früher kirchlich gesinnt, bat uns, nicht von den Eltern zu erwarten, daß sie sagten: Dein Wille geschehe! Es sei nicht Gottes Wille gewesen, dem des Kindes Tod zuzuschreiben sei, sondern der mangelhafte Stand der ärztlichen Wissenschaft. Die Zeit werde kommen, wo alle solche Krankheiten dem Fortschritt der Heilkunde würden weichen müssen. Wir mußten dem Mann in gewissem Sinn zustimmen und halfen uns mit dem bekannten dogmatischen Notbegriff der göttlichen **Zulassung,** sowie mit der erzieherischen Abzweckung aller Trübsale im Leben des Christen.

Jetzt lesen wir im „Expositor" (Nov. 1928, S. 145) in einem

Artikel „Funeral Service" von Rev. D. Earl Daniel (in Uebersetzung): „Sage nicht: Es hat dem Allmächtigen gefallen . . . . es sei denn bei dem Begräbnis einer sehr alten Person. Es ist eine Verleumdung des göttlichen Charakters den Eindruck zu erwecken, als hätte Gott ein Wohlgefallen an vorzeitigen Todesfällen, oder als hätte er eine Hand in Krankheit, Unglücksfällen und Selbstmord. Jedenfalls sind Laster und Unwissenheit dem Herrn nicht wohlgefällig."

Hier spricht nun nicht ein Laie, sondern ein Geistlicher. Nach ihm kann einer sagen: Es hat Gott gefallen . . . . wenn einer im hohen Alter stirbt. Stirbt er aber als Kind, oder in Folge eines Unglücksfalls oder einer Krankheit, so kann man es nicht sagen. Gott hat seine Hand nicht in Krankheit und Unglück.

Dies wird uns nicht als eine haltbare Lösung erscheinen. Wenn Gott seine Hand nicht hat in Krankheit, so hat er sie auch nicht in Gesundheit und Lebenslänge. Wenn ein Mann ein hohes Alter erreicht, so hat das ebenso gut natürliche Ursachen, als wenn er, sagen wir, frühzeitig der Schwindsucht zum Opfer fällt.

Was an den Ausdruck: Es hat Gott gefallen, Anstoß erregt, ist die Tatsache, daß man mit ihm den Gedanken der **Willkür** verbindet, als hätte Gott in despotischer Weise es so verfügt, und dem Menschen gezieme nur, ohne zu fragen sich unter das göttliche Diktum zu beugen.

Um diesem Mißverstand vorzubeugen, wäre die Wahl eines andern Ausdrucks anzuraten. Man könnte etwa sagen: „Da Gott die Seele . . . . aus dieser Zeitlichkeit abgerufen hat," oder: „Da die Seele . . . . die Zeitlichkeit abgestreift hat," oder ähnlich.

Es ist ja ohnehin wahrzunehmen, daß unsre Leute weithin vom Sterben **fatalistische** Anschauung haben. Wenn einer stirbt, so sagen sie: Seine Zeit war gekommen. Stirbt er nicht, so war seine Zeit noch nicht gekommen. Der Gedanke an ein göttliches oder allgemein überweltliches **Dekret** liegt dieser Idee zugrunde. Dies Dekret ist geheimnisvoll und es ist unveränderlich. Weder menschliche Kunst, noch christliches Gebet kann etwas dagegen ausrichten. Ein rein mohammedanischer Standpunkt. Erinnert man dagegen an den Fall von Hiskiah, zu dem es hieß: „Bestelle dein Haus, du mußt sterben!" und dem dann doch auf sein Bußgebet hin noch fünfzehn Jahre zugelegt wurden; oder fragt man sie im Fall eines Selbstmörders: Starb er, weil seine Zeit da war, oder weil er sein Leben selbst verkürzte? so wissen sie freilich nichts zu sagen, aber sie halten doch an ihrem Fatalismus fest.

Eine Aenderung der obigen Formel wäre also auch aus diesem Grund zu wünschen.

Halte was du hast!

In gewissem Sinn spinnen wir hier die Gedanken weiter, die wir in dem obigen „Destroy it not!" angeregt hatten. Nur daß wir uns hier auf die **Predigt** beschränken. Worauf wir jetzt den Ton legen wollen, ist die verschiedene Art unsrer Predigt verglichen mit dem, was wir gewöhnlich in Kirchen amerikanischer Abstammung finden. Wir haben in den hiesigen evangelischen Gemeinden fast durchgängig keine Gottesdienste am Sonntagabend. Das gibt uns reichlich Gelegenheit, die Kirchen andrer Denominationen zu besuchen und die Methoden ihrer Prediger zu beobachten.

Ein Punkt, der uns von jeher aufgefallen ist, ist das Fehlen des evangelistischen Charakters der Predigt. Wir hatten gerade erwartet, daß das Erweckliche stark hervortreten würde. Es ist aber nicht der Fall. In den amerikanischen Kirchen wird vorausgesetzt, daß die Glieder bekehrte Christen sind, natürlich mit einer starken Beimischung von allgemein menschlicher Unvollkommenheit, aber doch bekehrt, gläubig. Sie müssen in diesem Glauben oder in diesem Stand erbaut, gestärkt, gefördert, angespornt werden, aber die Grundlage ist gelegt. Das Evangelistische findet seine Anwendung in den Erweckungsperioden, die gewöhnlich im Winter gehalten werden. Dann hat man es aber mit Außenstehenden zu tun, die noch keine Glieder der Kirche sind. Allenfalls gibt man auch die Notwendigkeit zu, bei dieser Gelegenheit den Rückfälligen („backsliders") besondre Aufmerksamkeit zu widmen, die eine Art zweiter oder dritter Bekehrung bedürfen.

Bei uns ist es anders. Wir halten nicht dafür, daß diejenigen, die bei der Aufnahme die Absicht bekundet haben, ein christliches Leben zu führen, nun bekehrt sind. Wir streben demgemäß danach, so oft als möglich die Bekehrung zu Christo, die Notwendigkeit des persönlichen Glaubens, des Heilsvertrauens und der Heilsgewißheit zu verkündigen. Wenigstens tun das die unter uns, welche von dem pietistischen Oel unsrer Vorväter sich noch ein gemessenes Teil bewahrt haben.

Hier kommt uns die Einrichtung des Kirchenjahres, von der wir oben geredet haben, zu gute. Unser Glaube ruht auf Tatsachen der göttlichen Selbstoffenbarung. Von diesen Tatsachen zeugt die festliche Hälfte, insonderheit die Passionszeit. Neuerdings haben die Passionsgottesdienste auch bei den amerikanischen Kirchen Eingang gefunden. Aber man redet in denselben „de omnibus et ceteris," während wir uns auf das Leiden und Sterben Christi beschränken. Von dieser segensreichen Einrichtung des Kirchenjahres in seiner festlichen Hälfte sollten wir nie lassen. Unser Glaube kann nicht gedeihen, wenn er nicht wohl gegründet ist im Boden des Heils. Auch bewahrt uns diese kirchliche Sitte vor dem jäm-

merlichen Subjektivismus, den wir so vielfach beobachten, der in Wahl von Text und Gegenstand der eigenen Laune folgt und von der Gemeinde erwartet, daß sie ihm in allen seinen tollen Sprüngen nachkomme.

Dies Ruhen in den Heilstatsachen, diese Gewißheit, daß ein objektives göttliches Handeln unserm eigenen religiösen Verhalten vorausgeht, und daß wir von da aus die Autorität zur Verkündigung der göttlichen Gnade haben und nicht von unserm eigenen immer mangelhaften Glaubensstand, gibt unsrer Predigt etwas Positives und Festes, etwas Männliches und Gewichtiges, das wir drüben oft vermissen. Schon in den Ausdrücken kommt das zu Tage. Wir sagen nicht: „It seems to me" oder „I feel as though," wenn wir das Wort verkündigen, sondern: So spricht der Herr, oder der Apostel, oder der Prophet! Und wenn wir ein Lied zu Gottes Ehre anstimmen, so sagen wir nicht: „Shall we sing?" sondern: „We sing No. so and so."

Wir haben amerikanische Prediger gekannt, die uns an Gaben und sozialer Stellung weit übertrafen, auch großen Gemeinden vorstanden, die aber das Jahr hindurch über Texte aus den Sprüchen Salomonis oder ähnlichen Quellen der Moral predigten, niemals über die großen Probleme des Glaubens, seiner Fundamente, seines Wachstums und seiner ungelösten Rätsel.

Aus Mangel an solchem hehren Stoff verfallen sie dann auf allerhand Allotria, „Book reviews" oder politische Themata. Gewiß soll in unsern Tagen des „Social Gospel" weder die Politik noch sonst ein großes Lebensgebiet von der Predigt ausgeschlossen werden. Aber nur zu leicht ist der Wunsch nach Popularität, die Sucht nach Reklame, nach Sensation die Ursache der Reformversuche der Kanzelredner. Und nachdem sie eine Zeit lang in der Presse Beachtung gefunden haben, läuft alles wieder in seinem alten Bett weiter, und der moderne Prophet gleicht dem Simson, nachdem ihm die Haare beschnitten worden waren.

Es ist wahr, die Kirche dieses Landes ist kalvinischen Geistes und darum darauf angelegt, die Oeffentlichkeit, das bürgerliche Leben unter ihren Einfluß zu bringen. Unsre Kirche ist, oder war wenigstens, mehr lutherischen Geistes und überläßt die andern Lebensverhältnisse ihren eigenen Gesetzn. Es wird uns gut tun, von Kalvin und seinen Nachkommen zu lernen, doch auch das zu halten, was wir von unsern Vätern überkommen haben.

The Christian World

The Denver Y. W. C. A. and Social Reform

By James Myers

Composed of some three thousand girls and women of sixteen different nationalities, coming from every social and economic class; including on its board and committees some of the wealthiest society women in Denver, and in its many clubs girls and women of every occupation, business and professional women, industrial girls, and domestic workers; comprised also of women of many shades of religious faith, Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, the Young Women's Christian Association of Denver may be said to represent a cross-section of our modern industrial society. With conscious purpose the Y. W. C. A. has drawn all these young women under one roof and into a common fellowship "that they might have life and have it more abundantly."

The objectives and progress of this Association seem to me in certain respects to be unique and profoundly significant. I believe that they will repay thoughtful study by all who are concerned with the problem of the place of religion in social adjustment.

In the first place, the program of the Y. W. C. A. is aimed to meet the challenge of social cleavage. Lack of personal contacts between economic classes constitutes, to my mind, one of the most serious dangers of our civilization. Too frequently churches and other religious organizations are affected by the social cleavages of our economic order. They become known as "wealthy congregations," "suburban churches," or else as "working class churches." Too seldom do they gather one fold into a cross-section of our economic life. The Y. W. C. A. has gone out into the highways and the industries and the residential sections and has induced all classes to come in.

But the Denver Association discovered a few years ago that, although it reached out for all classes and included them in its program, a difference was still felt between the social thinking of its industrial and business girls and that of many of the board and committee women. As we shall see, the Association has now definitely set itself the task of social integration within its own walls. It has become an experimental station, a melting pot in the laboratory of social fellowship.

In the second place, the emphasis of the Association in its program of social reform has been placed on social education, rather than upon resolutions, pronouncements, or propaganda. I hasten to add that it does not confine its activities or program to "the zone of agreement" between capital and labor. Quite the contrary. It believes that only as the most controversial issues are frankly faced and freely dis-

cussed, can there be any hope of attaining fellowship. Not only so, but it definitely sets out to develop a "group consciousness," an awareness of their economic problems, among its business and industrial girls and domestic workers, in order that through constructive group thinking, leadership may develop which shall be able to interpret the realities of their problems to other groups.

The limitations of space make it impossible to describe the work of the Association in all its departments. A brief description of the Industrial Department will, however, indicate the methods adopted to inter-relate all the departments, and will illustrate the processes of social education which are at work in the Association.

I once heard a social worker raise the question whether the very names of various boards of control may not signify something of the philosophy behind an organization: a board of directors for the directed, a board of governors for the governed, a committee of patrons for the patronized! The Industrial Committee of the Y. W. C. A., in charge of the work of the department, is *representative.* Four women representative of the churches and the community sit in council with two garment workers, a bindery girl, a bookkeeper, a stenographer, two office workers, and a social worker. Together they decide upon the policies of the department, work out its program, and study the underlying economic problems which determine the needs of the industrial girls who make up the clubs. This committee made a study last year of "The Relation of Wages to the Lives of Industrial Women in Denver." They explored the field of wage theories, profit sharing, union wage scales, conditions in low paid industry, and the cost of living. In order to gather data and to bring the subject home, they called for volunteers, and a number of industrial girls are setting down day by day their "costs of living," classified under the standard items for budget study: food, shelter, clothing, recreation, church, medical care, education, savings, and miscellaneous.

After a year of research, the Industrial Committee brought up at the fall conference of the entire Association a question of policy. "If a girl comes to the Residence (maintained by the Y. W. C. A.) earning a wage of $7.00 a week, and our lowest rate for room and board is $5.00 a week, what is our obligation to the girl? To the entire situation?" This was no academic question. A girl had actually come to the Residence earning such a wage. Board members and committee members faced frankly their responsibility. How long was it right to subsidize a business? How soon should this girl be expected to earn a living wage? What were the factors which made necessary such limited earning capacity? The conference was not obligated to rely upon cold statistical reports for all of its information on these subjects. There were industrial girls present who helped the group to understand the problems which are faced by a girl who is trying to live on less than a living wage.

To the board and committee women, from their comfortable homes, the discussion was educational. Personal contacts between members of different economic classes are enlightening, creative of sound public

opinion. I heard the girl who represented one of the industrial clubs on the wage study say that they hoped eventually to secure enough data "to help get a minimum wage law working in Colorado." They already have this law on the statute books, but it is of small value to the women in Colorado industries, since the state has not passed an appropriation for its adequate administration. In the Denver Y. W. C. A. there is going forward that sort of fundamental social education which is needed to create a public opinion which in turn will assist upon intelligent social legislation, and adequate administration of the law.

Of recent growth is the Industrial Department's program for domestic workers. On their "afternoon off" girls and women engaged in house work are coming in increasing numbers to the Y. W. C. A. They find not only facilities for recreation, reading, gymnasium, and swimming, but also an opportunity for intelligent discussion of their occupational problems. A number of them have undertaken to keep records, to tabulate the number of hours they work each day, and to study the working conditions of their group, with the aid of a carefully worked-out questionnaire. "The very last thing that a girl is willing to do, no matter how badly she may need work," said Miss Patton, the employment secretary, "is domestic work." It appears that there are no standards of hours or wages or working conditions in domestic service. A girl never knows what to expect. Then there is the implication of social inferiority inherent in most cases. There is constant demand upon the Employment Department for factory jobs from girls now engaged in domestic work, but "willing to do anything but that." Industrial girls, on the contrary, practically never transfer to domestic service. It is fair to infer that there are valid reasons. There will be searchings of heart when, as is planned by the Y. W. C. A., "employers" and "employees" in this industry bring themselves in the spirit of Christ to confer as equals in regard to the occupational problems of domestic work.

The Monday Night Club is an interesting group. It is, in a sense, the "graduate school," the most advanced economic discussion group conducted at the Y. W. C. A. A girl is not ready for this group until after considerable experience and training in the clubs and committees of the Industrial Department. The Monday Night Club follows the tradition of the Association in its composition. It includes college students, school teachers, young labor leaders, industrial girls, a college professor (also young), and an employer. They have supper together at the Y. W. C. A., followed by discussion or an address by a special speaker. The club then adjourns to the Labor College at Grace Church, where the professor conducts a course on the problem of unemployment. This year the group also plans to try its hand at industrial research, making a study of one of the industries of Colorado. In this way the group will learn something of the technique of impartial investigation and the scientific approach of a fact-finding body. The area of conflict will be decreased as the parties to industry come to co-operate in the field of research. The project of the Mon-

day Night Club should prove of real value in their social education.

All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy, and it would undoubtedly have the same effect upon Jill. But the Y. W. C. A. takes no chances of such a calamity. When the whistle blows and the girls pour out of the factories and stores, they seek the Y. W. C. A. for its parties and dances, for the joys of a swim or a gym class, for the good fellowship of its club, and for the facilities of its beautiful building and its summer camp in the mountains.

They come also when they're out of a job. Three thousand girls each year find work through its efficient employment department. They come to the Room Registry of the Y. W. C. A. and find clean and decent places to live. These are the service features of the Y. W. C. A., but the real life of the Association is in its clubs and their social and educational activities.

The girls have their own committees and plan their own activities. Committee meetings, even when they are planning a dance—boy friends invited—are conducted according to parliamentary rules of order, first lessons in democratic procedure on the side!

The Committee on Education finds out what the girls themselves want in the way of classes, works up registration, and secures a teacher. The result has been courses in music, featuring the ukulele, the piano, a glee club, and an orchestra, in dramatics, in arts and crafts, in appreciation of beauty, in "food combinations," in interior decorating, "making the house enchanting," in sewing, in "poise, charm, attractiveness, and personal magnetism," in English literature, and in psychology. A course entitled "Me, My Friends, My Home," covered the whole field of a girl's personal problems, her relations with her boy friends, and her plans for her future home.

The girls' Publicity Committee publishes a quarterly paper for the department. A Co-operative Bookshop sprang from the Monday Night Club. Nothing that is human seems to be foreign to the program of the Y. W. C. A. Yet they are driven back again and again to the consideration of industrial problems. "The girls are naturally fatigued at the end of a day in the factories or stores," said Miss Clark, the Industrial Secretary. "Many of them are too tired even to come out to the Y. Others, as a reaction from the monotony of machine or repetitive work, seek the thrills and excitement of the public dance halls. Others don't make enough even to afford the 25 cents for a club supper or the 5 cents a week for dues. Any organization which seeks to assist industrial girls to attain the good life, one of refinement, culture, and beauty, will be forced to study the industrial conditions, the wages, and the hours, which make such a life almost impossible for many industrial girls to-day."

Miss Clark, by the way, was described to me by a state official as "the best informed person in Denver" on the subject of women workers in industry. She visits the factories and becomes acquainted with the management and the girls, whom she invites to come to the clubs at the Association. The Y. W. C. A. does not establish industrial branches in connection with particular companies. It maintains

its activities entirely in its own building, where its policies may be under its own control. Miss Clark has compiled a valuable list of industries, showing the number of women employed, general conditions, wages, and names of managers. She is the contact person for the Association with the labor organizations also. She attends the meetings of the Central Trades and Labor Assembly, is a member of the Board of Directors of the Labor College, and a member of the Teachers' Union. All these contacts give her invaluable information and acquaintance. She is able at times to take up with the management in a friendly way some of the troubles which the girls report to her, and to get them adjusted.

Two girls go from Denver Association each year to the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers in Industry. A number attend the Workers' Summer School at Geneva Glen, Colorado. One has just returned to Denver after a full course at Brookwood Labor College. She has gone back to her trade in a union tailor shop and is active in the Y. W. C. A. and manager of the Co-operative Bookstore. The Finance Committee of the Industrial Department arranges dances, bazaars, and other events throughout the winter, to send their delegates to the summer schools. It is the hope of the Association that informed, intelligent leadership for the women's labor movement may come from these carefully selected and specially trained women, carrying the high ideals of the Association into the difficult field of industrial relations.

The Y. W. C. A. has certain union contacts. The girls insist on a union orchestra at their dances. A union engineer is in charge of the power plant. Growing out of a suggestion from an officer of the local waters' and waitresses' union to the Denver Association, a request has been sent by the Executive Board of the International Waiters' and Waitresses' Union to the Food Service Department of the National Y. W. C. A. for a joint commission to study the matter of the employment of union waitresses in the tea rooms and cafeterias maintained by the Association. A local committee in Denver is also going into the matter from all angles.

The Industrial Department also feels a responsibility for community education in the industrial field. The public was invited to a "demonstration" by the girls of the industries of Denver in which they themselves were engaged. On the stage before the audience the girls went through the motions of their daily jobs, on machinery loaned for the purpose by their employers: book-binding, bread making, telephone operating, the manufacturing of tailored suits, silk underwear, shirts, overalls, uniforms, bags, and cookies, the packing of tea, work in a laundry and in a beauty shop, and the work of a domestic maid, a salesgirl, and a waitress. A motion picture film supplied by the Women's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor, entitled "Women Who Toil through the Ages," was also shown.

Another annual event in community education is the Florence Simms Memorial Program put on by the Industrial Department. Last year the industrial drama "What Price Coal" was given; this year

they hope to produce a play centering about the life of workers in the sugar-beet fields, Colorado's other leading industry.

By a clever device all departments of the Y. W. C. A. are kept in touch with one another's work. Representatives from each department attend the committee meetings of each of the other departments. They act as liason officers, bringing the point of view, for instance, of the Industrial Department to the councils of the Health Department, the Business Girls' Department, the Education Department, the Religious Education Department, the Phyllis Wheatley Branch (colored), the Employment Department, and the Girl Reserves. Then there is the General Council of the Association, made up of representatives of all departments. The Board of Directors itself is composed of home women, business women, industrial women, and colored women.

"Out of all our group thinking," said Miss Wilson, the General Secretary, whose spiritual genius is felt throughout the life of the Association, "there emerges something bigger than any individual could create for herself; it does something to each one in the group." A song frequently heard in the Denver Young Women's Christian Association seems to epitomize the purposes of the Association in its vital processes of social in-tegration:

BREAK DOWN BARRIERS

O World of Industry from sea to sea,
Filled with barriers of race and creed;
O loving neighbors, hear our plea,
In this age of strife and greed.

Chorus

Break down barriers—change our thoughts
With the help of the One above;
Break down barriers, change our thoughts,
Help widen the reach of love.

Father of mercies, help us to find,
'Mongst the people of every land,
The loving Brotherhood of mankind,
And help us to understand.

—*The Christian Leader.*

The Dilemma of Liberalism

JOHN W. DAY*

Every liberal church, of whatever name, practises full hospitality. "The liberal deviseth liberal things." Some churches go farther than others in this respect. The bars which define their principles are put lower and lower, so that jumping over them is not considered a defiance of them, and gates are placed at convenient intervals. Some

*The Rev. John W. Day, D.D., is minister of the Unitarian church in Kennebunk, Maine.

take down their bars altogether, and leave them lying about, as interesting survivals, where they do not even impede progress.

Unitarians go so far as to declare that there are no lines at all, and accept those who choose to come into their fellowship, whatever their religious belief, or lack of belief. They carry freedom beyond its limit, and decline to recognize any degree of incongruity or contradiction as involving inconsistency. Inconsistency itself appears to be a glory. Having no fences, no gates are necessary.

At liberty to believe what each one pleases, and deny any belief, such liberals enjoy an admirable sense of ventilation. The air never gets stuffy, for it is always out of doors. Their denomination is never domination. No one ever exercises dominion over the faith of any one else. No Unitarian wants any more doctrine than he has. The word creed applies not at all. Not even to one alone, for he does not wish to tie his mind to anything he can not change or abandon. No one needs a card on his reception days, and hosts are never embarrassed by their uninvited guests. Any one is a Unitarian who says he is, even if he isn't.

An open door like this is so hospitable that one would think that all the world would take advantage of it. Jefferson thought it would, at least so far as the United States was concerned. A church of such large spirit, so purely catholic because at the farthest remove from Catholicism, would seem likely to become the church universal. It should be crowded.

Why is it one of the smallest? Why have Unitarian churches in this country suffered such a marked decrease in numbers, even while some of them show constituencies larger than any in their history? Why does the Unitarian Year Book betray a shrinkage of at least twenty per cent in the number of active Unitarian churches during the last quarter of a century?

The explanation that this shrinkage is more a paper shrinkage than an actual one, that more correct returns of late years account for a diminution which was due to faulty returns of earlier years, does not explain all of such an extraordinary reverse, making largeness in welcome coexist with smallness of response. With all such allowance that any one could reckon, there would remain the same problem. The dilemma of liberalism, after all is said, is real: How can liberty and freedom coexist with contradiction and disagreement? How can two walk together in opposite directions?

The reason why the uninvited sneak into receptions is that they may obtain the distinction of being among the invited. The remedy the host has is to watch his doors, and employ detectives to spy out interlopers. It has long ago been proved that such heresy-hunting will not work in organizations with any claim to be liberal. But because liberals can not and would not adopt any method of exclusion is no reason why they should go the lengths of insincerity and give equal welcome to opinions which are mutually exclusive. Hosts need not be exclusive while the nature of things is inherently exclusive. They could not be expected to stultify themselves and give the glad

hand to persons who laugh at their family portraits, track in mud, ridicule their friends, smash their furniture, clutter up their lawns, and park gum under their tables. It is no violation of hospitality, even of the most public sort, to treat those who impose upon it according to their own principles. "Let us talk in the garden," Emerson said when repeated invitations to his visitor to allow him to take his hat, brought the reply that it was against his principles to uncover in any one's presence.

Freedom of opinion is not invaded when one declines conversation under conditions which make it impossible. Liberty is not enhanced by people who are so timid, in fear of being thought illiberal, as to endorse any note which is submitted for their signature.

Distinctions which really exist ca nnot be erased in order to avoid the inconvenience of entertaining them. Pretending to ignore them for the sake of peace and union, does not bring the same kind of peace, and the same degree of union, that come with entire sympathy and understanding. Doing away with heresy trials does not make it less disadvantageous to ship passengers who intend to scuttle the vessel. Keeping open house will not be satisfactory if people who do not belong there find themselves tolerated rather than received. They can not be barred or rejected. If they like the fellowship of a hotl rather than that of club or a home, no one need deny them. The Unitarian gastropods whose shells are occupied by ecclesiastical hermit crabs can not do anything about it. They do not need to. But they need feel no obligation to give over all their shells to the hermit crabs.

No, because fagots are out of fashion, and heresy trials, in any disguise, are no longer available, and we are cordial to everybody, is no reason for thinking that we should take over to ourselves the responsibility which belongs to those who take selfish advantage of our cordiality. We may say, "So glad to see you," and "Must you go?" but when they are gone, and the house is quiet, and the family can get together again in a communion which must be that of a family, honestly now, as William Everett once said, "Ain't it nice?"

Let nature take its course. We worry needlessly about what to do with those who are out of place with us. Let them alone. In time the eternal fitness of things will prevail. And then we shall have better fellowship with landmarks and understandings and classifications than we could ever have by trying to do away with them. Liberals will get out of their dilemma by snapping out of the creed complex, by realizing that there is no tyranny of creeds more enslaving than that of fearing them. Very bad masters, they may be made very good servants. For it is sure that no church will ever grow strong which does not give people clearly to understand what it is all about, and say plainly what it is going to do about it. Nor has any church entirely dispensed with creeds or their equivalent. In fact utter creedlessness is as inflexible a creed as was ever welded.—*Christ Leader* (Universalist).

Different Viewpoints

The essential difference between the Anglo-Catholic and the liberal is not in the last analysis that the former would introduce Roman practices into a Protestant Church. The vital difference is that the two stand for divergent beliefs. While it is true that the mass, auricular confession, prayers for the dead, the rosary, benediction of the blessed sacrament, stations of the cross, holy water, and children's eucharist are features associated with Roman Catholicism the liberal is opposed to them not for that reason merely but because they represent a way of thinking that contradicts the principles upon which our Church rests.

Every man has the inalienable right to worship God as he pleases. He may be a Roman Catholic, Greek or Mohammedan. That is his personal responsibility. He may be what for want of a better name has been called Anglo-Catholic, which seems to mean that such a person would adopt the practices of the Roman Church without going so far as to accept the rule of the Pope. But in such case it is the duty of such a person to go where kindred views are held. It is a very different matter when instead of throwing his lot in with those who would accept him, he attempts to change the organization, in which he now is, into one that fits his individual beliefs. Such action overrides the rights of those who still would preserve their Church intact as it is now.

It is folly therefore to hope for peace in our Church so long as such antipathetic viewpoints are maintained. There may be certain things desired by the Anglo-Catholics which the liberals would be willing to grant. There are certainly many they would not. There may be many things for which the liberal stands that the Anglo-Catholic would accept. There may be others he could not. Until these points have been settled and the two opposing parties can settle upon some common ground it is futile to talk of peace.

It does no good to assert as do the well-intentioned modernists that there is room in the Church for both groups. To say that is much the same as to try to avoid danger by closing one's eyes to it. So long as there are two points of view so diametrically opposed because of fundamental beliefs no solution of the trouble will come from pretending they do not exist.

Whether it is unfortunate that our church is protestant is beside the question. The fact is that it is protestant and must so remain until it is changed by the general consent of its members. To remain a member in it and yet disregard its character by anti-protestant practices is bound to destroy its unity and block its efficiency.

Why not then frankly admit we have reached an impasse and attempt to reason the difficulties out. There is much that could be eliminated from our Church which would make it more efficient in modern society. All this the liberal would gladly see go. Probably the Anglo-Catholic feels much the same. It remains to discover what can be the common ground upon which both can stand.—*The Chronicle.*

Loss In Clergy

A writer in *Scribner's* has indicated the serious situation confronting the Protestant Church today in an article called The Vanishing Clergy. He points out the loss in clergy for 1927 in some of the churches, which bodies he claims represent about one-half of the entire Protestant membership of this country:

Denomination	Loss in Clergy, 1927
Baptist (14)	451
Lutherans (20)	68
Presbyterian (U. S. A.)	29
United Brethren	95
Reformed	13
Scandinavian Evangelical	20
Unitarian	16
Brethren	29

The author, the Rev. Dr. John Richelsen, says, strikingly and frankly, "Consternation was created when the statistics . . . . for the year 1926 were given out, covering all religious bodies in America, and it was shown that, in spite of the gain of half a million Church members over 1925, there was an actual net decrease of 647 in the number of clergy. Now the statistics for 1927 prove an additional net loss, and this time of 1,387 clergy, a total loss in two years of 2,034 ministers, while there has been a net gain of over 1,000,000 members in the same period. Also it should be made clear that these losses become far greater if the Catholic Church be taken out of the computation, for this body gained 360 clergy in 1926 and 1,211 in 1927. If these offsetting gains of the Catholic clergy are taken out of the calculation, the remainder of the American religious bodies show a total loss in clergy for the last two years of 3,605."

Mergers and Truth

If the proposed merger between Congregationalists and Christians shall come to pass, it will be a real step toward unity. The respective positions of the two denominations closely approximate each other. However it must imply that Congregationalists no longer deem the baptism of infants important. Perhaps no baptism at all seems to them of great moment. If such is the case, the merger may well be made. But if Congregationalists still stand for the baptism of infants, as once they did, we should think that the merger can only produce trouble. On the other hand, if Christians still adhere to the belief that the celebration of the Lord's Supper is the only acceptable act of worship, we cannot see how they can merge with Congregationalists, who are far from holding that belief.

For after all, the question of a merger in the religious world goes back to the prior question of what truth, if any, is worth holding to. If both bodies have determined that their previous positions need not be maintained, then by all means let them be merged. But if these

principles, to which each once held tenaciously, are now held to be negligible, what is there in Christianity that is still deemed important? We ask this, not in the way of criticism, but in order to discover, if we can, what is the conception of Congregationalists and of Christians as to the value of what have heretofore been their respective beliefs.

What has hitherto stood in the way of unity between Christian bodies is differences in belief and in practices. If it "does not matter what one believes," neither body has any hold on truth that is worth maintaining. Why, then, does any denomination assert anything? Unity based on that principle would seem easy—and valueless.

Our own problem, of course, is one that presupposes that truth is important and must not be compromised. It is true or it is untrue that only a priest can legitimately celebrate Holy Communion, only a bishop can legitimately make a priest. This is the principle underlying our tenacious hold upon the historic episcopate. If the principle itself is true, we cannot merge with bodies that hold to the contrary belief. If it is false, we have no right to occupy a separate position in Christendom. Even if some body was to accept the historic episcopate in fact but not use that episcopate for the creation of priests nor restrict the consecration of the Holy Eucharist to priests (which of course includes bishops), it would be impossible for the Church to accept the compromise.

Bodies holding substantially identical principles in Christendom ought to unite. Congregationalists and Christians must determine for themselves whether such be the case as between them. Bodies holding differences that are largely academic need not necessarily be separate; thus the Church can tolerate a condition whereby its own members and schools of thought differ as to the exact interpretation, e. g., of the Holy Communion, so long as all parties do that which all of them agree to be adequate, and all of them act reverently toward the sacrament. Such tolerance must, however, be based on agreement as to what is to be done.

No merger can ever be successful that treats truth as negligible. In order that Congregationalists and Christians may merge, we should suppose that both must agree that infant baptism may legitimately be practiced or not practiced, that Sunday worship may consist of the Holy Communion or it need not. If both parties have reached those two conclusions, it follows that they have both been wrong heretofore; one wonders on what ground they hope to be right in future.—*The Living Church.*

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)
NOTE—Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.

Old Faith and New Knowledge, by *James H. Snowden.* Harper and Brothers, New York and London, 1928. 279 pages. $2.50.

Dr. Snowden here adds to his previous (20) volumes (such as "The World a Spiritual System," "The Basal Beliefs of Christianity," "Can We Believe in Immortality?", "The Psychology of Religion," "The Truth about Christian Science," etc.), another, on the relation between faith and knowledge. The question, "can religion and science be coordinated?" has been treated times without number in our day. The Fundamentalists believe there is a conflict between the two, the Modernists say there is absolute harmony. This author sides with the latter. In his opinion the principle of Modernism is not a newly found method at all, it runs through the whole Bible and the history of the Christian Church. By this he means that there is always progress from the old to the new and better. At each stage of the revelation the old faith was brought up to date and modernized in accordance with new religious knowledge and faith. His whole book is written to show the validity of this thesis.

The first chapters are given to general interpretation of the nature and authority of religion and science and attempt to show that they both need each other. The theologian must not assume that he can disregard the authority of an expert in a special field; nor should the scientist encroach upon the domain of metaphysics or revelation.

After that the writer takes up his task of tracing modernism through all the pages of Holy Writ. The story of the creation (Gen. 1) is a "tremendous piece of modernism." Moses—or who ever wrote it—takes up the pagan traditions of the origin of the world, purges them of their polytheistic and fantastic trappings, and gives us a story that for simplicity and sublimity is hard to match in any literature of the world. What enabled him to do this? It was, so answers the writer, disclosed to the Hebrews by observation and experience. Here the reviewer would rather say, with Fr. Delitzsch, that the spirit of revelation was responsible for the superiority of the Bible account.

Moses is a "Modernist", a progressive, coining new insight in authoritative form. The same progress to higher conceptions is found in the idea of God in the Bible and in its ethical content. The prophets appear: it is their undying glory that they moralized religion and spiritualized and universalized worship. Jesus himself is in a way a Modernist.

The Old Testament is abrogated by the New, Jesus is the substantial fulfilment of Old Testament shadows and types.

The early church had its great Modernist in Paul, who taught it to shed Jewish narrowness and take in the Gentile world for its field of action.

And so the author goes on applying his principle to the great periods of the Church: there were times of conflict, mistakes were made by the church and by science; the ultimate outcome is that there is only one truth, whether found by science or experienced by religion. The ways to it may differ but they must all lead to the same result or to different aspects of the same reality.

In conclusion he says: "All that modernism has done so far is only a beginning of what it must yet do. We must let it work but try to keep it under the guidance of the Spirit of all truth.

Old faith and new knowledge when worked out in their logical relations are not mutually exclusive and antagonistic but are complimentary and harmonious. They join in reaching wider truth and better faith. They are the two main architects and builders of our world and they look out upon a vast and inviting future. Faith and knowledge are consistent materials and constructive builders of one grand temple of worship, concordant strains of one vast cosmic symphony and song. By their origin and nature they are wedded into union, however, at times they have been temporarily estranged, and what God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

To a large extent most of us will agree with the author that the man of faith must always keep his mind open to new knowledge, fortified by the assurance that truth is only one and that the facts of the natural world cannot ultimately contradict those of the spiritual.

In his attempt to show that the principle of modernism runs through all of Bible and church history, he goes to extremes. Modernism is the tendency to coordinate faith and science. Moses and the men of the Bible had no such task. In their message to the world of their day they relied on revelation in finding and applying moral and spiritual truth. They thereby became critics of the views and practices of their day, but they had nothing to do with science. The modernist looks largely to science for new light; the prophets, on the contrary, drew from the inner light inspiration and power.

Another point where we feel the writer is not sufficiently clear is in his position on what is authoritative in religion. He first assigns to reason the place of supreme authority in the mind; then to conscience in the moral sphere; then to the *Christian consciousness* as the court of last resort. To him the Bible itself is not the highest authority, but the Bible interpreted and, as it were, brought up to date by the Christian consciousness. Whatever portion of truth there may be in this view, we hold that no man in great trouble, in great sin or in great problems would turn to the Christian consciousness. The Word only would be his infallible guide in faith and life.

The book discusses all the relevant questions connected with the subject in great fulness and clarity. The writer closes with the Apostolic Creed; he is enamored with modernism but wishes to hold fast to the essentials.

Creative Prayer, by *E. Herman.* George H. Doran Company. New York. 218 pages.

There have been a good many books on prayer in recent years. They may be divided into two classes, those which treat of its scientific aspect, whether it be from the standpoint of philosophy or from that of psychology, and those which are written with a purely devotional purpose. This book endeavors to elucidate the meaning and value of prayer as a *creative* process, whereby the man who prays and his world are made anew. "Such prayer," the author—an English woman—says, "demands a committal of soul, a self-surrender, which takes us into the deepest heart of religion. To make this surrender is to became a high-priest of divine mysteries. But while there are those who in a flash, as it were, pass from the market-place to the Holy of Holies, most souls need to traverse the outer court and to tarry in the place of preparation. Two trusty aids await in there: Silence and meditation. Quasi-occult writers have so represented both as to prejudice us against them. But they are not mysterious and fanciful pursuits, peculiar to the high-strung devotees of mystical cults. They are, on the contrary, part of the natural discipline of the healthy soul bent upon communion with God. They are as simple as daylight, and as sensible as reason itself."

In going on, however, we soon notice that the writer learns more from the mystics than from the orthodox, and more from the medieval or old-Catholic church than from the Protestant. Her sources are the Blessed Angela of Foligno; St. Teresa; St. Paul of the Cross; St. Benedict and his followers; St. Gertrude; Philip Neri; St. Francis. There is no quotation from the Protestant mystics as far as we see, not from the Quakers even, or from Tersteegen. We certainly get the impression that the gift of prayer is more a Catholic virtue, and that the monks of the desert can teach a modern world more than we had ever thought.

She has a long and impressive chapter on the ministry of silence, so hard to practice by us moderns. "The saints were capable of spiritual silence simply because they had not contracted our modern habit of ceaseless talk in their ordinary life. Their days were days of silence, relieved by periods of conversation, while ours are a wilderness of talk with a rare oasis of silence." "A state of inner poise and harmony can be attained only by means of a natural, progressive discipline dating from early childhood. The cultivation of a habit of silence is an integral part of all true education (witness the "silent time" in a Montessori school)." "One hour of silent listening to the voice of God may give us a deeper insight into the mysteries of human nature, and a surer instinct for divine values, than a year's hard study or external intercourse with men." To Silence ought to be added Meditation. She does not recommend continuous Bible study so much as topical, reflection on the great doctrines of our faith, the great master-facts of the spiritual world—God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, man, sin, grace, death, judgment, the Church Holy and Catholic, the Kingdom that shall have no end. Prayer is not asking for favors from God, it is communion

with him, it is the means of getting from Self to God, to the world of which God is the center.

If we are faithful and persistent in our search for God we "become conscious of the birth of the Christ-spirit within ourselves, and of our own birth into a new and wonderful world. We are given a set of new values. Things that but a little while ago seemed desirable now appear as dross. We discover untold beauties in God; we find in Christ secrets of final restitution that fill us with deathless hope." With the new joy there comes opposition and estrangement, perhaps even from our erstwhile friends. Besides, dryness and depression replace our feelings of happiness and fulness. The period of religious "romanticism" cannot last. The first well-nigh intoxicating sense of God's presence, the first inrush of unconquerable might and dauntless confidence leave us to make room for something less vivid and joyous, yet even more solidly sustaining—a deep calm peace, a sense of perfect rest in God. The writer continues to describe the ups and downs of the spiritual state, the progress of the believer from emotional experiences to real power. It is by way of self-discipline, of sacrifice, of suffering. In opposition to the modern insistence on self-expression, she upholds the principle of Christian asceticism, an asceticism that seeks no merit but to make spirit and body the willing instrument of God's hand.

Being a mystic and extolling the experience of the mystic life, one might think that she would be closed to the social demands of the gospel. This is not the case. In the chapters "the Apostolate of prayer" and "the Priesthood of prayer" she looks upon the "saint", the believer having the spirit of Christ, in his representative position. He is part of the body of Christ. In his intercession for the body of Christ, in his belief in the one gospel for all races, he fulfils a corporate mission. One who passes from self to God will always be led by God to humanity: God's Kingdom, God's will—his redemptive and reconstructing will for humanity—will be the concern of his prayer life and his whole life.

The writer, speaking mostly of prayer and its regenerating effect on the interior life, naturally has nothing in particular to say on the change of economic environment. Still, in the sense mentioned, she stresses emphatically the social implications of the Christian faith.

She has a high idea of prayer and of the price to be paid for it; too high, we fear, for most of us. Yet it will do us good to read the book. We shall feel, as seldom before, the contrast between our prayers as they are and as they might be.

Seekers After God, by *F. W. Farrar*, Canon of Westminster, New York. John W. Lovell Co. 305 pages.

We can well imagine that some of our readers will laugh at us when they see us review a book whose author has been dead more than a quarter century. Still we are not ashamed, unusual though this course doubtless is; and we are sure that if we can persuade some to read this book, we shall have rendered them a service. Farrar's fame as an author rests on his Life of Jesus and the Life of Paul, books

which it would be foolish to undertake to review now. But his "Seekers after God" is far less known. This volume has the same characteristic traits as the other well known productions; namely, an unusual acquaintance with classical antiquity, a great charm of style and a fascinating vividness of description. Moreover, it deals with stoicism, whose ethical principles are often so close to Christianity that early Christian teachers are frequently said to have borrowed from contemporary stoics. Farrar describes the lives and teachings of Seneca, Epictetes and the Emperor Mark Aurelius, the foremost stoics antiquity has produced. His subject is therefore apt to shed light on the question whether the superiority is on the side of Christianity or Stoicism. *Seneca* was born at Cordova, Spain, about seven years before Christ, of a Roman father and a Spanish mother. When he was still an infant, the parents moved to Rome. The father was wealthy and it enabled him to give his son a careful education. He had several children, one older brother of Seneca being the Gallio, we hear of in Acts 25: 19 ("Sweet" Gallio, Seneca repeatedly calls him, adding that Gallio had a horror of every form of adulation). The stoic Attalus was Seneca's teacher. The pupil tells us that his teacher taught them to live, not to argue.

From his earliest days Seneca adopted the principle of self-denial. It was certainly not easy to follow such principles at the time, for never probably was there any age or place where the worst forms of wicked men were practiced with a more unblushing effrontery than in the city of Rome under the government of the Caesars. He who would see to what depths the Gentile world had sunk at the very period when Christianity began to spread may form some faint conception from the picture of it drawn in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. And Seneca's active life was spent under the rule of such monsters as Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius and Nero. The chapters dealing with this period are some of the most interesting in the book. We can read only with horror of the cruelty and depravity of these wearers of the imperial purple and of their wives, such as the Messalinas and the Agrippinas.

It would have been better for Seneca's welfare and fame if he had never had a desire to shine in such a place. But he had the ambition not only to be a philosopher but also a man of the world. He was wealthy, and wealth was his temptation. In his writings he extolled the poverty of the man who was rich in the treasures of mind and character, but in actual life he moved in such luxury and boundless affluence that it incited the jealousy of princes. It was impossible to live a consistent life as the companion of the dissolute and powerful; he was bound to stoop to the most degrading compromise, and such compromise as ruined his character brought about his down fall.

The emperor Caligula (his real name was Caius), the successor of Tiberius, became so jealous of the oratorical fame of Seneca as an advocate, that he marked him out for immediate execution. Seneca saved himself by retiring into obscurity. Under Claudius, Seneca, through the hatred of Messalina, the wife of the emperor, was ban-

ished to the barren and pestilential shores of the island of Corsica. Here, in these savage wastes and amidst the boorish illiteracy of the islanders, he spent years in lonely and galling exile. He tried to "seek happiness not in circumstances but in himself," but in time his internal resources failed him. He had no access to the consolations of a living faith. He even fell so low as to write letters full of lying flattery of the emperor, which he hoped would find the imperial eye. They contrast strongly with the bitter language of intense hatred and scathing contempt which Seneca poured out on the memory of Claudius after his death. They show the limitations of the stoic, but they did him no good.

Long weary years followed, of which we know nothing. Then Claudius died (from eating a poisoned mushroom handed to him by his own wife, Agrippina). Thereupon this woman, as Tacitus tells us, to counterbalance the feeling of horror her crimes had inspired by a stroke of popularity, recalled from the waste solitudes of Corsica the favorite philosopher and most popular author of the world to become the tutor of her son Nero, who was to become Claudius' successor on the throne. We cannot follow Seneca in his vicissitudes as the teacher and counselor of his notorious pupil. His influence was good for a short while, but he weakened his position by a policy of concessions from the start. Soon his pupil entered upon his career of crime and licentiousness. He murdered his brother and his mother, and Seneca wrote letters of fulsome flattery, with these murders in mind. Nero got tired of his mentor. Charges were trumped up against him, and he was sentenced to seek death by his own hand.

The author compares Seneca's teachings with the Christian religion and finds that, as far as moral illumination was concerned, Seneca was not far from the Kingdom; that few men have painted more persuasively the pleasures of virtue, the calm of a well-regulated soul, the strong and severe joys of a lofty self-denial. "When the hour of crisis came which tested the real calm and bravery of his soul, he was not found wanting." It is true that Seneca died with noble fortitude; nevertheless, his life showed such glaring inconsistencies that we cannot warm up to him very readily. It is far from us to throw stones at him, we might have done much worse in his place. Still the other two stoics in the book have a larger claim to our admiration. Besides, their teachings are treated more fully than those of Seneca. Seneca's life is described with rare skill, it reads like a fascinating historical novel. That he was a "seeker after God," however, is not made so very convincing.

Unfortunately, we have not the space to discuss the other two heroes of the book, Epictetus, the slave, and Mark Aurelius, the emperor. The writings of Epictetus find adequate treatment; but the life of Aurelius is pictured for us with such a warmth of admiration that it wins our own whole-hearted affection.

In conclusion, the author says, Seneca sought for ease, Epictetus for freedom, Marcus Aurelius for self-government. By the light of reason and nature they have found moral truths and expressed them

in such manner that the early fathers were glad to see in them forerunners and way-preparers of their own faith. What they did not have was the theistic conception of God, the gospel and person of Jesus Christ, an example and a fruitful source of Christian life. Stoicism was the faith of a few for a few. The gospel of the love of God revealed in Jesus was preached to the many, to the poor and lowly first. It had in it the power to save the individual and human society.

Contributions of Science to Religion, by *Shailer Mathews*, Dean of the Divinity School, University of Chicago. D. Appleton and Co., New York, London. 1927. 427 pages.

Religious faith must ultimately be vindicated by being shown to be in accord with reality. It must meet the standard of rationality. Christianity is passing at the present time through a new cycle of revaluation. On the one side it is being questioned as to its ability to furnish motives sufficient to enable men to face the moral problems incident to a social order like ours. On the other side it must vindicate its right to exist in our age of scientific inquiry. It is this latter issue that the present volume undertakes to meet. It attempts to answer the fundamental question whether our scienctific knowledge forbids or justifies our continued faith in God.

The author has asked representatives of the various scientific fields to give the actual scientific findings which challenge our inherited religious conceptions. In the first and second parts of the book we get the contributions of these scientific authorities. In the first part, entitled "The World given by Science," W. E. Ritter writes on "The Method of Science"; Robert A. Millikan, on "The Structure of Matter"; Edwin B. Frost, on "The Structure of the Cosmos"; Edw. B. Matthews, on "The Making of our Earth"; C. Judson Herrick, on "The Nature of Life"; John M. Coulter, on "Plant Life"; Horatio Hackett Newman, on "Animal Evolution"; Ellsworth Faris, on "Social Evolution"; Chas. H. Judd, on "Mind and Evolution". In the second part, "Scientific Cooperation with Nature," John M. Dodson writes on "Recent Contributions of Medicine to Human Welfare"; Chas. B. Davenport, on "Eugenics"; E. Davenport, on "What Science has done for Agriculture"; C. E. A. Winslow, on "Sanitation". It might be asked what the articles of the second part have to do with the legitimacy of the Christian world view. The answer is, they describe typical experiments in furthering human welfare by proper adjustment of life to the impersonal forces in the environment of the universe. Religion is an essentially similar adjustment of life (but through personal relations) with our environment.

The center of the author's thought is not philosophical or metaphysical, but practical. He does not seek at the outset to prove the existence of God. Religion as a phase of social life in the universe of realities is to be judged.

In the last part of the book, "Religion the personal Adjustment to Environment," the writer draws his conclusion. Religion, seen from its biological past, is "man's conscious attempt to place himself in help-

gaining relationships with those superhuman forces in his world upon which he realizes his dependence, and which he treats as he would persons whom he wished to aid him." The religious impulse can be traced to the observable beginnings of the race, but it has had a long history of an upward evolution. This process goes on. At the present time there is emerging in the world a religious phase the nucleus of which is that of the teachings of Jesus (the *nucleus* of the teachings of Jesus, not the whole of them). The theology of this coming religion will be based not on metaphysics of the Godhead interpreted by human analogy but on those judgments of value and those undeniable facts of science which seem to condition all self-expression. In this struggle of religions to express religion, Christianity in its ethical and theological sense is certain to be a dominant element.

The scientific method which starts with experiment, develops a working hypothesis and tests this hypothesis with new experiments, will have to be applied to the religious field. No longer can the validity of religion be decided by authority, the authority of the church or the Bible. As a product of human experience it must be shown to minister to human welfare and to be consistent with other beliefs that express reality. It is comparatively easy to show the social values of religion and, especially, of the Christian religion. It has, in the past, for one thing, preserved ancient civilization from destruction by the barbarian invasions. It has taken the arts under its tutelage and contributed to their growth. But the new knowledge of today challenges inherited values. If e. g. naturalism and materialism eliminate the supernatural element from the universe; if prayer is nothing but inner self-communion, if faith in the divine is an illusion: how long would even conventional religious activity endure? Mere utility cannot satisfy the need of life with what philosophers might call an ontological God, i. e., a God who really exists. Even Kant's position that God himself can never be known, but that his existence must be assumed as necessary for our moral life, is unconvincing. For our faith would in that case rest on a mere assumption. If we, then, must admit a reverent agnosticism as to infinity (God), does our new knowledge of the universe disclose in the universe that which favors the religious world-view and warrant faith in a God of things as they are and are becoming?

In the next chapter the author answers this question favorably by showing that the new conception of matter has ended the old materialism; that astronomy is forcing us to believe that the ultimate activity is infinite; that as to evolution it is impossible to think that personality would evolve from the exclusively impersonal. Science is also giving new content to the conception of God (a God in whose infinite activity we live and move, whose self-expression environs us in the eternal process towards personality which science is helping us read"). Science may not justify our faith in the God of love or explain the existence of evil. In looking towards the future we may not have ground for optimism but we are certainly justified in holding to what W. James calls "meliorism". Our scientific knowledge justifies our religious faith when it must assume an intelligible, order-producing

process. The greatest contribution of religion is its adventurous assertion that the values which are invisible to the microscope and the telescope are eternal; that the universe of life is a universe disclosing good-will.

"We reach then the end of our study, not in an absolute knowledge of that which lies beyond experience, nor yet in some truth that is beyond doubt, but in the right to live religiously. Religion is more than knowledge. It is life itself, adjusting itself to the mystery of its environment, gaining from that experience new confidence and development and erecting the new and more personal environment of society. Religion may never hope to explain the cosmos, but man can live religiously in the cosmos with self-respect as long as our growing knowledge of its operations shows religion to be rational and science itself partakes of a kindred faith."

With the author's final conclusions before us, we are now in a position to say what we think of them and of his book. He had set himself the task to find out whether, in the light of the new science, it was possible for us to still lead a religious life without sacrificing our self-respect as men of the 20th century, i. e., as men who believe in the achievement of science. These achievements were set forth in the first and second parts of the book. After taking due consideration of these findings of the scientists, he stated that a decent respect for the men of science does not forbid us to hold fast to our religion. We may never get over "a reverent agnosticism as to infinity" (God); our study will never reach the end in some truth that is beyond doubt; we may never be justified in optimism but we certainly are in believing that things will be better and better. And if this "melioristic" attitude satisfied W. James it ought to satisfy us.

This is all that Dr. Mathews, one of the high-priests of Modernism, is able to give us. Doubtless a very unsatisfactory result. But from the way he went about it nothing much better could be expected. A Christian scholar who is sure of his faith should never put the question in the manner he put it: Will modern science allow us to keep our religious faith? Our faith is not in the keeping of scientists. The Christian religion is a redeemer religion. Its center is our faith in Jesus Christ, our Saviour. That there is in Him salvation for the individual and for society is the article with which the church stands or falls. This faith is based on personal spiritual experience; on the testimony of Scripture and on the experience of the church in all ages. The fact that we have a modern conception of the Bible and don't believe in verbal inspiration, doesn't make a particle of difference as to its message of Christ, as to the gospel of the Son of God.

The author has nothing to say on this central truth. All he ventures to assert is that the moral and spiritual values of the Christian religion will be a dominant element in the religion of the future. Such a vague generality will not satisfy any one. Religion, he says, is in the future to be based on experiment, on its being a helpful feature in our adjustment to a changing environment. We can't rely on Bible testimony any more; our authorities must be the scientists. As a

consequence, after listening to all they have to say, he lands in a "reverent agnosticism," he never reaches a truth that is beyond doubt: still he keeps on believing, or, rather, hoping that, in the absence of certainty, it may be better to keep on than to give up.

There will always be mysteries that cannot be solved—and all light on these mysteries that science can give ought to be welcomed. There will always be evils, in nature and in life, sorely trying the faith of the believer. But the power to overcome, the fortitude to hold out will, as in the case of the apostle (Rom. 8), be drawn from the experienced love of God in Christ, not from meliorism, or even optimism.

A Critique of Joseph McCabe's "Triumph of Materialism", by *William Schoeler.* The Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio. 124 pages. $1.00 net.

In an essay appearing in the July-September number of the Haldeman-Julius Quarterly (1927), Joseph McCabe, ex-priest and famous English rationalist, writes on "The Triumph of Materialism". This essay falls into six main divisions: Materialism and Idealism; What is Matter?; The Supposed Vital Principle; The Human Machine; The Mystery of Consciousness, and Determination and Morals. He takes the position of bald materialism; that matter is everything and explains everything; that life is but a chemical process; that thought is but a functioning (phosphorescing) of the brain; that there is no "vital principle"; plan or design in the universe.

This position seems at the present time rather antiquated. When matter has been proved—or is assumed—to be not an inert mass but composed of electrons revolving about their nucleus with an inconceivable rapidity of motion; when leading men of science admit that there is no evidence for spontaneous generation of life: at such a time to come out with a confidently written paean on the Triumph of Materialism seems almost to out-Haeckel Haeckelism.

The author of this book takes up every one of the six points McCabe makes in his essay, and demolishes them either with sound logical reasons or by the testimony of high scientific authorities. The book is written for the general reader and, at this time of debate on "Man a Machine," etc., will furnish welcome ammunition to the apologist, or at least to the ordinary Christian man who can't study the heavy works of the professional expert.

Christianity and War, by *August Ruecker.*

Brother Ruecker has put this little pamphlet on War in our hands which he and Mr. Ernest Bruncken have jointly written. It is a strong condemnation of this foremost collective evil we have on our hands, and challenges the church to take decisive steps to abolish it, or, at any rate, to declare war to the knife on it.

War was shown in all its hideousness in the last great struggle, not only its destructiveness of life and property, but the poisoning of

the mind by propaganda and the purposely engendered national hatreds.

While the memory of its stupendous folly and its murderous passions are still fresh, steps must be taken to enlist public opinion in the effort to make another war impossible. Faith in peace and hatred of war must be implanted in the individual Christian. But the individual alone cannot stand against collective opinion. The Church must lend its powerful help. What she can do in influencing public opinion and removing evils as old almost as the race, can be seen in the temperance and prohibition legislation of our country. The early Christian church was opposed to war. When the state became Christian the church was not able to make its early antimilitaristic attitude the policy of the state. Still the "Truce of God" movement of the Middle Ages curbed the war fury at least on certain restricted days and periods. What can the church do now? The church has from time to time expressed her view on matters of faith in confessions, which as articles of faith became universally binding on its members. Something like this, so thinks Mr. Rueker, she ought to do now with this great and pressing question of the abolition of war. Each church for itself and the Federated churches of the country ought to formulate strict and clear pronouncements against war. She should in unmistakable terms declare against every and all wars.

Here Mr. Bruncken takes up the argument. He approaches it from the legal side. Some other means of settling disputes than force must be found. Law must become a substitute for war. What is at present known as public international law is a body of rules attempting to regulate the manner in which wars shall be carried on. What we need is an international law regulating conduct in times of peace, and an international court having, among other things, the right to test all treaties in a manner analogous to private contracts, i. e., were the treatises based on military force or on justice and equity? The first thing would be to agitate for the convening of an international meeting of lawyers, economists and leaders in all walks of life for the task of drawing up the future international code. It would take a number of congresses to really accomplish something, but in time progress would be made, public opinion would get back of it, and the verdict of an international court would not be easily set aside by any nation.

The pamphlet is to be used for propaganda purposes in Brotherhoods, Leagues, etc. We wish it the best of success. The outlook is not very encouraging, but the challenge must be met. If the churches failed us they would forfeit the right to call themselves after the Prince of Peace.

Festgabe für Theodor Zahn. Theodor von Zahn am 10. Oktober 1928 zum 90. Geburtstag gewidmet von der Theologischen Fakultät in Erlangen und der A. Deichertschen Verlagsbuchhandlung in Leipzig, 1928. 238 S., geh. 10 Mk., geb. Mk. 12.50.

Dem Altmeister des Neuen Testaments, der mit 90 Jahren noch seinem

Werke in aller Frische obliegt, werden in diesem Band 11 Aufsätze, geschrieben von Mitgliedern der Erlanger Fakultät, auf den Tisch gelegt, der erste ist von Phil. Bachmann: „Stellung und Eigenart der sog. Erlanger Theologie." Der heilsgeschichtliche Charakter derselben wird schon von **Harleß,** ihrem ersten Vertreter, stark betont: „Gibt es keine Heilsgeschichte, die von Gott aus geschehen ist, so ist der Mensch sein eigener Heiland und Erretter." In **Hofmann** aber, ihrem berühmtesten Wortführer, findet diese ihre Eigenart ihre klassische Darstellung. Seine „Weissagung und Erfüllung" ist eine Darstellung des geschichtlichen Inhalts der Bibel. „Der ewige Plan der Liebe Gottes tritt als wirksamer Wille in die Geschichte ein und macht sie zu einem folgerichtigen, in der Bewegung auf ein großes Ziel hin zusammengeschlossenen Ablauf. Aus der großen Gesamtbewegung tritt Jesus Christus hervor als ihr überragender Höhepunkt; aus ihm wieder erwächst die Gemeinde, in deren Bewegung sich die Urgeschichte wie die Geschichte Israels und die Geschichte Christi selber vorläufig vollendet." Der Buchstabe der Weissagung gehört seiner Gegenwart; aber ihr Sinn weist über die Gegenwart hinaus. „Indem die Kirche die Bibel handhabt, um sich in der Lebensgemeinschaft mit Christo zu behaupten, gewinnt sie eine Erfahrung davon, daß ihr nie ein Bedürfnis göttlicher Wahrheit und Einsicht entstehen könne, das sich nicht aus der Schrift befriedigen ließe." **Frank** ist der große Dogmatiker der Erlanger Schule. In seinen drei Systemen der christlichen Gewißheit, Wahrheit und Sittlichkeit gibt er, oft in scharfer Auseinandersetzung mit A. Ritschl, ein festgeschlossenes Gebäude christlicher Dogmatik und Ethik (mit dem Ton auf der Dogmatik). Er geht von der Tatsache der Wiedergeburt aus. Hier liegt die Quelle der Heilsgewißheit, hier auch die Fundgrube für das Ganze der erfahrenen Heilstatsachen. Von diesem Zentrum aus konstruierte er, in direkter Aussage oder im Weg der Schlußfolgerung, das ganze Glaubens- und Heilssystem. Man könnte fast sagen, er liest die ganze Konkordienformel aus seinem christlichen Bewußtsein ab. Natürlich orientiert er sich an der Schrift und der kirchlichen Dogmenentwicklung; aber die Heilserfahrung, am Wort Gottes gemacht, ist die letzte Instanz. Daß es hierbei nicht ohne Selbsttäuschung und Willkürlichkeiten abgeht, ist selbstverständlich. Aber doch sind die drei „Systeme" Franks ein imposanter Bau, der von seiner Geistesschärfe, seiner Gelehrsamkeit und seinem festen Glauben beredtes Zeugnis ablegt.

Die Erlanger Theologie ist stark lutherisch, antiunionistisch, jedoch nicht bloße Repristination des alten Luthertums (wie Philippi oder Kliefoth), sondern eine selbständige Verarbeitung des lutherischen Erbes in den Gedankenformen der Neuzeit.

Die andern Beiträge sind: P. Prockſch, König Josia; H. Strathmann, Ist der gesetzliche Eid noch haltbar? H. Preuß, Bachs Bibliothek; W. Elert, Zur Geschichte der kriegerischen Ebsos; Fr. Ulmer, Wesen und Umgrenzung der Liturgik; P. Althaus, „Bekenne einer dem andern seine Sünden"; W. Völlrath, „Denn auch deine Sprache verrät dich"; Fr. Hauck, Die Freundschaft bei den Griechen und im Neuen Testament; L. Post, Zu Amos 7, 10—17; Fr. Hauck, Zahn-Bibliographie 1919—28. Alle diese Aufsätze sind auch einzeln zu haben zum Preise von Mk. 0.90 — 2.40.